

The Selected Works of MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD

**Volume VIII
(1954-55)**

Chief Editor
DR. RAVINDRA KUMAR

ATLANTIC PUBLISHERS & DISTRIBUTORS

Preface

Dr. Shri Ravindra Kumar is an admirer of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. This is nothing unusual. Maulana Azad had numerous admirers in the course of India's struggle for freedom. The number increased appreciably after India attained freedom. Partition of India was the heavy price India paid for this freedom. Maulana Azad had throughout his whole political life opposed forces which encouraged separatist trends in our national life. It was in the partitioned India that people realised more vividly the soundness of the views Maulana had expressed on the communal problem.

Maulana Azad was among the major figures in our unique struggle for freedom waged under the leadership of Gandhiji. The Selected Works which Dr. Ravindra Kumar has edited bring out the greatness of Maulana Azad in several fields of life. He was most assuredly an outstanding scholar, a great journalist, a matchless orator but with equal ease he was also a great statesman who played a significant role in every crisis which India and, in particular, the Indian National Congress, faced from time to time in its struggle to make our country free and independent.

He had also his due share in shaping India's destiny in her first decade of Independence. He was an outstanding member of the union cabinet but what was more important was the mature advice he made available to his comrade and fellow warrior Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the latter sought to grapple with India's difficult and daunting problems in the first crucial phase of her independence.

Dr. Ravindra Kumar may not yet be a mature scholar but the enthusiasm he has shown in portraying the intellectual and political life of Maulana Azad deserves commendation. The country is still faced with problems which greatly exercised the Maulana's mind. What he thought and said on these problems would still be a source of inspiration and enlightenment to his countrymen in the difficult days through which we are all passing.

Sadiq Ali

Introduction

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was a great Parliamentarian who proved himself to be a pillar of strength to the veterans of the Congress Party and the Union Cabinet headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Being an outstanding educationist and thinker, he became the stoutest champion of all progressive causes in the fields concerned.

He was a man who through his ideas on the role of religion and politics, strengthened national unity and integrity. It was his fundamental belief that being a Hindu or a Muslim or a Sikh or a Parsi or a Christian or a Buddhist, a person can be a true nationalist by observing his or her religion. But in order to realise that it is necessary that India's old culture and civilization should be properly linked with modernism. He, in this regard, pointed out clearly:

'If in our midst there are Hindus who believe that there can be restoration of Hindu life of thousand years back then they should be clear in their mind that this is merely utopian and obviously such a dream can never be fulfilled. Similarly it applied to Muslims who if they labour under the illusion that they can revive their old culture and civilization of a thousand years back which they brought from Iran, Arab or Central Asia then this is also a well nigh impossibility. My only appeal to such people is that they should not entertain such a misconception because such a concept is far removed from reality'.

Thus, in Maulana Azad's thinking nationalism was a matter of faith and conviction and not merely based on antiquated concepts. To quote himself again:

'I am that fundamental element who has himself made India, therefore, I never abandon my claim to be Indian'.

I am grateful to the staff of National Archives of India specially to its Director General Dr. R.K. Parti and Assistant Director Shri P.R. Malik, Mrs. Meena Kapoor, Mrs. Manju Sehgal, Shri Pramod Mehra and Shri N.P. Sharma, President Shri Sadiq Ali and other staff of Gandhi National Museum and Library, Rajghat, New Delhi, Dr. Ravindra Kumar, Director, Dr. Hari Dev Sharma, Deputy Director,

Shri A.K. Awaṣṡhi and others of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti House, New Delhi, Librarian and other staff of Parliament Library, Sansad Bhavan, New Delhi, officials and staff of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel National Memorial and Navjivan Trust, Ahmedabad and staff and officials of Kakasaheb Gadgil Pratishthan, Pune for providing me important literature in their possession.

I am greatly indebted to His Excellency, Hon'ble Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma, Vice-President of India, Hon'ble Shri Shiv V. Patil, Speaker, Lok Sabha, His Holiness, Maulana Syed Abul Hasan Ali Nadvi, Rector, Nadwatul Ulama, Lucknow, Hon'ble Dr. (Mrs.) Najma Heptulla, Deputy Chairperson, Rajya Sabha, His Excellency, Hon'ble Shri B. Satya Narayan Reddy, Governor of U.P., Dr. Karan Singh, Dr. Akbar Ali Khan and other officials of Abul Kalam Azad Oriental Research Institute, Public Gardens, Hyderabad, Shri Babubhai Jashbhai Patel, Shri V.N. Gadgil, Shri Hitendra Desai, Shri Jitendra Thakorebhai Desai, Com. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Shri Nathubhai Naranji Naik, Shri A.J. Jalbi, Shri S.G. Mohiuddin, Mrs. Kamlesh Ravindra Kumar, Dr. Malti Malik, Prof. K.L. Malik and others for their kind encouragement, guidance and co-operation in many ways in preparation of this Volume (No. 8).

My special thanks are due to Dr. K.R. Gupta and Shri Manish Kumar Gupta of Atlantic Publishers and Distributors for undertaking the publication of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's works courageously.

– RAVINDRA KUMAR

Abbreviations

A.B.E.	: Advisory Board of Education
A.B.T.C.	: Adult Board Training Centre
A.I.C.T.E.	: All India Council of Technical Education
A.M.	: Ancient Monuments
B.E.	: Basic Education
C.A.B.E.	: Central Advisory Board of Education
C.L.R.I.	: Central Leather Research Institute
D.E.I.E.W.	: Department of Education in Indian Embassy, Washington
E.M.	: Education Ministry
E.S.R.S.	: Establishment of Salt Research Station
G.S.D.E.I	: Grants to Study for Development of Educational Institute
H.M.E.B.	: Hyderabad Money in England Banks
H.N.P.	: Housing and National Prosperity
I.A.D.D.M.	: Indian Academy of Dance, Drama and Music
I.C.T.E.	: Indian Council of Technical Education
I.M.	: Indian Musicians
I.N.C.C.U.	: Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO
L.L.	: Literature and Life
L.Z.Z.	: Lead Zinc in Zawar
N.A.I.	: National Archives of India
N.A.L.	: National Academy of Letters
N.G.S.S.T.	: Non-Government Secondary School in Tripura
N.L.	: National Library

N.L.H.	: National Language Hindi
N.L.I.	: National Library of India
N.M.	: Nature and Man
O.S.D.	: Other Scientific Department
P.T.E.	: Progress of Technical Education
R.A.I.U.	: Research Aid to the Institutions and Universities
R.E.	: Reform in Education
S.A.R.L.	: Sindhi as Regional Language
S.C.G.O.T.	: Seminar on the Contribution of Gandhian Outlook and Techniques
S.I.S.S.A.	: Scholarships to Indian Students Studying Abroad
T.R.D.D.M.	: The Role of Dance, Drama and Music
T.S.E.C.R.	: The Secondary Education Commission's Report
T.S.T.B.W.N.	: The Solution of Tensions Between and Within Nations
U.C.S.	: UNESCO Coupons Scheme
U.E.	: UNESCO and the East
U.S.E.F.	: United States Educational Foundation
V.A.	: Visual Art
W.S.W.C.	: Welfare Scheme for Women and Children

List of Documents

S. No.	Subject	Date
1.	Address at the 22nd Conference of C.A.B.E.	12-1-1955
2.	Presidential address at the Session of I.H.R.C.	25-1-1955
3.	Written answers to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha in connection with the scholar sent to Germany under the Indo-German Industrial Cooperation Scheme	22-2-1955
4.	Regarding the Arid Zone Research in India by UNESCO	28-2-1955
5.	Regarding the amount granted for scholarship by the Ministry of Education	3-3-1955
6.	About the report of the Scientific Man-power Committee	20-4-1955
7.	About the National Archives in the House of People	22-4-1955
8.	Regarding the Unemployment	22-4-1955
9.	Regarding the Tribal Education	26-4-1955
10.	About the V.W.O.	26-4-1955
11.	About the U.G.C.	29-4-1955
12.	Regarding the Indian Museum	29-4-1955
13.	Regarding the Wheat Loan Education Exchange Programme	29-4-1944
14.	Regarding the Scholarships	29-4-1955
15.	Regarding the Yogic Research	29-4-1955
16.	About the Minister's Discretionary Fund	29-4-1955
17.	About the Loans given by the Ministry of Education, in the Council of States	6-9-1955
18.	About the Certificates and Degrees to Displaced Persons	6-9-1955

S. No.	Subject	Date
19.	About the Foreign Students in Indian University	6-9-1955
20.	In connection with the presentation of Books to foreign countries	6-9-1955
21.	About the Training Centres for Basic Education	6-9-1955
22.	About the Production of Cheap Audio-visual Aids	6-9-1955
23.	Regarding the scholarships for study of foreign languages	6-9-1955
24.	Regarding the All India Federation of Educational Associations	6-9-1955
25.	Regarding the image of Chalukyas Period	6-9-1955
26.	About the Hindi Exhibition	6-9-1955
27.	Regarding the UNESCO Fellowship Scheme	6-9-1955
28.	Regarding the text books scrutinised by the Central Bureau of Text-Book Research	19-9-1955
29.	Regarding the Mines and Minerals Act of 1948	19-9-1955
30.	Regarding the N.M.L., Jamshedpur	19-9-1955

PART II

31.	Further discussion on the University Grants Commission Bill presented in the House of People by Dr. M.M. Das, on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad on 20-2-1954	28-2-1955
32.	-do-	22-11-1955
33.	-do-	24-11-1955
34.	-do-	25-11-1955

APPENDICES

35.	Answers of Shri K.D. Malaviya in the House of People, on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked regarding the Monazite	15-3-1954
-----	---	-----------

S. No.	Subject	Date
36.	By Dr. Das about the Central Translation Library Scheme	18-3-1954
37.	Reports regarding the Demand for Grants of Education Ministry presented in the House of People and accepted by Maulana Azad	18-3-1954
38.	Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad by his Parliamentary Secretary in Rajya Sabha about the All India Primary Teachers' Organisation	23-8-1954
39.	About the Fulbright Scheme	26-8-1954
40.	Motion for election to the court of the B.H.U. and programme of election thereto	26-8-1954
41.	Election to the Court of the B.H.U.	1-9-1954
42.	Answers on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha, by his Parliamentary Secretary about the I.T.E.S.E.	1-9-1954
43.	About the N.C.F.D.	1-9-1954
44.	About the D.E.G.C. of UNESCO	1-9-1954
45.	About the Scholarships	20-9-1954
46.	About the National Library and the Linguistic Survey	20-9-1954
47.	About the Scout Organisation	20-9-1954
48.	Regarding the A.F.S.I.I.S., Bangalore	21-9-1954
49.	Regarding the setting up of a Match factory in Delhi	21-9-1954
50.	Regarding the P.S.S.E.C.	23-9-1954
51.	Regarding the study of foreign languages	23-9-1954
52.	In connection with the Welfare Extension Projects	23-9-1954
53.	In connection with a visit of Dr. Peter	23-9-1954
54.	About the displaced students in Manipur	23-9-1954
55.	About the development of libraries	23-9-1954

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	-----	v
<i>Introduction</i>	-----	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	-----	ix
List of Documents	-----	xi
Documents	-----	1
Appendices	-----	294
Who's Who	-----	332
Glossary	-----	333
Chronology of Events	-----	334
Index	-----	335

Document No. 1

Maulana Azad's address at the 22nd Conference of C.A.B.E. on 12-1-1955

I have great pleasure in welcoming you to this 22nd meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education. The year under review has been marked by intense and varied activity in all fields of education and you are aware of many of the interesting developments that have taken place. To recount all of them would take too much time, but I would like to bring to your notice some of the more important developments which have taken place and promise to yield increasing returns in the coming years.

I shall take up first the question of basic education. For a long time it has been accepted that the prevailing system of elementary education must be replaced by basic education. Progress has not, however, been in conformity with our expectations. There has been an increase of only about 2,500 basic schools in the course of the last four years. The main reasons for this have been lack of the right type of teachers, inadequacy of training facilities and the large initial cost of establishing a basic school. About two years ago, the Centre decided to take a direct part in the expansion of basic education. Accordingly, we offered assistance to the States for the establishment of one intensive basic education centre in each State. A further step has now been taken by the decision to offer to all the States 30 per cent of the expenses for the conversion of the existing elementary schools into basic schools. So far as the establishment of new schools is concerned, it is hoped that the co-operation of the Centre and the States will enable us to ensure that they are increasingly of the basic pattern.

As you know, the progress made in this field in different parts of the country has not been uniform. The Government of India have therefore decided to appoint a small committee which will visit areas where basic education has struck root and make an "on-the-spot" study of the developments. We propose to utilise the report of this committee for the planning of a programme of expansion of elementary education on basic lines in order to fulfil as early as possible the constitutional

obligation on the State to provide free and compulsory education to all children of 6-14 years. You will also find in the agenda a proposal for the constitution of a standing committee for basic education which can meet frequently and advise the Government of India on various technical and other issues connected with basic education.

Steps are being taken to expand the programme of social education in the country. You will remember that I spoke to you last year of the Central scheme for the expansion of education by the employment of new teachers in elementary schools and of social workers in select centres in urban areas. This was also intended to relieve the pressure of educated unemployment. I am glad to tell you that under this scheme a total of about 66,000 teachers and 2,000 social workers have been allotted to the various States up to November 1954.

The greatest emphasis during the current year has, however, been placed on the reconstruction and improvement of secondary education. I think you will all agree that this has till now been the weakest link in the Indian educational chain. It is yet, in a sense, decisive in determining the quality of education both at the elementary and the collegiate levels. Secondary schools supply teachers for elementary schools and students for colleges and other institutions of higher learning. An unsatisfactory system of secondary education undermines the entire system of education in the country.

You will remember that at the last meeting of the Board, I placed before you my ideas on secondary education. This is the stage up to which all should have the opportunity to go. In any case, it is the stage which marks, and will continue to mark the end of education for the vast majority. It should therefore prepare them for life, but I must regretfully admit that our secondary education does not at present fulfil this end.

The Government have, on your advice, generally accepted the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission and initiated measures to give effect to them as early as possible. Discussions are being continually held with the State Governments, the universities and Boards of Secondary Education in order to carry out various necessary measures of reform. I will refer briefly to only some of the more important steps already taken in this behalf.

The duration of secondary education has been a subject of controversy over a number of years. Unfortunately, even the Secondary Education Commission did not give a clear lead in this matter and left it to the State to have either an eleven or a twelve years' secondary course. This

has made it difficult to correlate secondary education with the universities and to ensure that there will be a uniformity of pattern both at the secondary and the university levels throughout the country. This question was taken up in a conference of the Education Secretaries held in November 1954. It was agreed to get round the difficulty by prescribing that 17 plus should mark the end of secondary education. There can be doubts and differences about the standards and courses in the secondary schools but there can be no doubt about the prescribed age. So long as the completion of Secondary education and entrance thereafter to the university is fixed at 17 plus, the States may regulate the stages subject to the general pattern laid down by the Secondary Education Commission. Since the Constitution lays down six as the age for the commencement of compulsory education for all, this would favour an eleven years' course from six to 17 plus. However, this is a matter which requires careful consideration and I hope that the Board will give a clear lead to all the States.

We are all agreed that the standards of secondary education need to be raised. It has been suggested that the extension of the secondary course by one year will raise the standard of attainment and prepare pupils for entry into various vocations. As a result, there will not be the same rush for higher studies and it will reduce the pressure on the universities. I am happy to note that many of the universities are willing to fall in line with the suggestion of both the Radhakrishnan and the Mudaliar Commissions and agree to the institution of a three-year degree course at the end of the Higher Secondary School Certificate.

Another defect of the existing system of secondary education has been the lack of facilities for pupils with different abilities, aptitudes and tastes. The need to establish a large number of multi-purpose schools is therefore obvious but in spite of encouraging beginning in some of the States, the vast majority of secondary schools are still of the academic type. The main difficulty here again has been lack of resources in men, material and funds. You will be glad to hear that the Government of India have already initiated a scheme for the conversion of 500 high schools in the country into multi-purpose schools before the end of the present Plan period. It is proposed that the distribution of the schools will be on the basis of one multi-purpose school for each district. This will leave a balance of a little less than two hundred schools which will be utilised to meet the special requirements or demands from the various States. In addition, the Central Government have accepted a scheme for the improvement of teaching and equipment in another

1,000 to 1,500 schools during the same period so that roughly 20 per cent of the secondary schools in the country can be raised to a higher level. The multi-purpose schools will all be higher secondary schools and provide various types of courses in arts, science, agriculture, commerce and technical studies.

Steps have also been taken to set up a Textbook Research Bureau and a Bureau of Vocational and Educational Guidance. You will agree that an improvement in the quality of textbooks is essential if secondary education is to improve. In view of the proposed diversification of course, it is equally important to ensure that pupils select their courses according to their aptitude, taste and ability. Immediate steps are therefore necessary to organise educational and vocational services, though these need not be of a very elaborate character in the beginning. The Central Bureau of Vocational and Educational Guidance will offer all possible help to the State Governments which may wish to set up their own Bureaux of Vocational and Educational Guidance. I would also suggest for your consideration that each State should set up a Board with the object of surveying opportunities for employment in its area and make the necessary information available to all the headmasters of secondary schools.

You will agree that the key to all educational improvement lies in a better type of teachers. Efforts are being continually made for the better training of teachers and generally improving their professional efficiency. I mentioned to you last year about the All India Headmasters' Seminar which was held in Simla. Its results were so promising that during the current year eight more Seminars have been organised on a regional basis. In addition, some of the States have organised their own Headmasters' Seminars. I am convinced that these Seminars are one of the most effective types of in-service training and represent one of the best forms of investment in education.

All these measures designed to increase the duration of the course, raise the standard, diversify the syllabus and improve equipment and library services are being pursued in close co-operation between the Central Government and the State Governments. The results will be reported to the Board, but I have felt that in view of the urgent need of improving the quality of secondary education, it would be desirable to set up a smaller body which could meet more frequently and review from time to time the progress made. I am therefore contemplating the setting up of a Council of Secondary Education more or less on the lines of the All India Council of Technical Education. The proposed Council

will review the progress of secondary education throughout the country and serve as an expert body to advise the Government about the improvement and expansion of secondary education in all its phases. It will examine and appraise proposals submitted in this behalf to the Central Government and assist in the implementation of approved programmes. It will also maintain a nucleus of specialists in various fields of secondary education and thus increase through membership of its staff the number of Indian educationists who have had experience in the analysis and solution of problems of secondary education on all India basis.

In the field of university education, I have already reported to you that the University Grants Commission was set up in November 1953. A Bill to give it statutory recognition has been introduced in Parliament and is under its consideration. It is a matter of deep regret that we have lost the first Chairman of the Commission, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar, before the Bill could be passed. In him we have lost one of our most eminent educationists who could have helped to build up the right traditions for the Commission.

In the meantime, you will be glad to hear that certain steps have been taken to increase the salary of teachers in the Universities and expand the facilities of higher education in various directions. After the attainment of independence, it became clear that our universities did not have adequate facilities for the study that our universities did not have adequate facilities for the study of the language, history and culture of important regions of the world. Some provision existed for the study of the civilisation and culture of Europe, but there were no faculties or departments which gave young Indians the opportunity of acquiring specialised knowledge of the Americas, the Middle East or the various zones of Asia. It was at the same time clear that India's increasing participation in international affairs demanded that there must be men and women with specialised knowledge of the language and culture of all important regions of the world. A beginning has now been made by taking steps to establish an institute for the study of Asian languages and culture at Benaras University, of the culture and languages of the Middle East at Aligarh University and a School of African Studies at Delhi University.

I will not go into details in the field of technical education as I surveyed it recently when I addressed the All India Council for Technical Education. Its report is before you and you will see that the progress in this field has been fully maintained. I would only add that

the site for the Western Higher Technical Institute has been selected and action initiated for the establishment of Regional Schools of Printing as well as a School of Town Planning.

I have referred to the need of research in textbooks to improve their quality. Textbooks cannot and should not, however, be the only reading material for the growing children and adolescents. Great nations have taken justifiable pride in their children's literature. In India we have an ancient tradition that can challenge comparison with similar literature in any other country. In recent times, we have, however, neglected this important branch of literature and left unutilised the vast potential material that lies at our command. We have, during the last year, taken the first steps to remove the deficiency. Publishers are being encouraged to enter this field and produce literature that will satisfy the needs of our children and adolescents. Our schemes in this field are three-fold. Firstly, the Ministry will produce, under their own auspices, a few books so as to serve as examples and set the standard for other publishers. Secondly, we have commissioned the publication of a series of 25 books for children on selected subjects. Finally, we have offered 20 prizes for good and well-produced children's books in all the Indian languages. Two thousand copies of each prize-winning book will be purchased by the Central Government for distribution among schools, libraries and children's centres.

Perhaps even more than in the case of children, we must provide suitable literature for the neo-literate adults. I made a brief reference earlier to the expansion of social education in the country. One of the main obstacles to such expansion in the past has been the paucity of suitable literature. Adults who became literate often relapsed into illiteracy because of this fact. There is, however, an additional danger which arises out of lack of suitable literature. If the neo-literate adults do not find healthy and wholesome material to engage their minds, they are liable to resort to literature of an undersirable type. This is a problem which we share with most countries of the world. In many cases, increased literacy has led to a lowering of standards and taste. The main reason for this is lack of suitable literature for the average man. In the absence of creative and wholesome books, cheap comics, crime and sex stories and sensational political propaganda take possession of his entire mind.

The Government have therefore undertaken a special programme for the production of literature which, while it will be true to the traditions of our Indian heritage, will also seek to develop in the minds

of the neo-literate adds a scientific and critical spirit, alive to the problems of the modern age. For this purpose, the Central Government have initiated a scheme whereby publishers and writers will be guaranteed a minimum sale of books, of the requisite quality. In addition, prizes are awarded to specially qualified books. You will be glad to hear that this has already evoked a wide interest from writers and publishers. In October 1954, 35 books in 14 Indian languages received governmental recognition or awards. We are now contemplating an extension of the programme of offering every possible encouragement to promising writers and publishers in all Indian languages. We have also planned to produce in the several volumes a popular Encyclopaedia in Hindi. This is intended to provide useful reading material of general interest to neo-literates. The first volume has been prepared and sent to the press and I expect it will soon be out.

The current year has also been marked by intense and varied activity in the field of culture. You are aware that a national academy of letters, the Sahitya Akadami, was set up in March and a national academy of fine arts, the Lalit Kala Akadami, in August 1954. The National Gallery of Modern Art was opened in March 1954. A delegation of Indian artists was sent to the U.S.S.R. and a cultural troupe received from China. In addition, India participated in several international cultural conferences and sponsored art and culture exhibitions in various countries. An exhibition of Indian Art Through the Ages is at the moment touring some of the countries of Europe and the Middle East. The system of cultural scholarships has been attracting an increasing number of students from many foreign countries. Our students are also going abroad under various programmes of cultural exchange.

One of the most important developments in the field of cultural activities in the current year has been the organisation of a number of youth camps throughout the country. These are intended to give our young men and women in high schools and colleges an opportunity of living together and participating in various forms of creative and social activities. More than 300 such camps have already been held and more are planned in the coming months. In a sense, the culmination of such programmes for the youth of the country was the organisation of an All India Youth Festival in which students from almost all the Indian universities participated. The Government provided funds to bring them to the capital and house them in Talkatora Gardens. The various items they put up were evidence of the rich diversity of the culture of

India. The Festival which gave an opportunity to a large number of young men and women from all parts of India to live together in common fellowship is bound to strengthen the bonds of unity among them and develop in our youth the consciousness of their Indian heritage.

I would also like to say a few words about the various activities undertaken in co-operation with Unesco. We participated in important projects like the Translation of Classics and the Arid Zone Programme. Our delegation played a very important role in the Eighth General Conference of Unesco and I am glad to inform you that the Ninth General Conference will be held in India. This will be the first time that one of the U.N. agencies will hold its general session in this part of the world.

You will remember that at the last meeting of the Board I spoke to you about the need for changing the existing rules of recruitment to various government and other services. Under the existing rules, the possession of a university degree is a necessary condition for recruitment to all excepting the lowest service. This has led to an undue pressure on the universities and also to a sense of frustration among a large number of our educated youth. You will be glad to hear that this matter has been considered by the Government and a committee of specialists is being appointed to examine the question and submit specific proposals.

If the possession of a degree is no longer a prerequisite for employment, we hope that the pressure on the universities will diminish. It is, however, necessary to ensure that only young men and women of the highest calibre proceed for higher studies. At present, entry to the universities and even to the high schools is often dependent mainly on the financial position of the family. A democracy cannot flourish unless it offers equality of opportunity to all and takes every care to see that the best among its youth get the opportunity to develop their abilities. One measure for the equalisation of opportunity is the initiation of a system of scholarships in the various residential schools modelled on the British Public School.

It is generally admitted that these schools offer a better standard of education than our existing ordinary schools but obviously it is impossible to raise 10,000 high and higher secondary schools to the necessary level immediately. Until such time, we must ensure that boys and girls of requisite ability are not denied the opportunity of receiving the more satisfactory education which public schools at present offer. One of the main criticisms against public schools in the past was that they catered

only to the needs of a rich minority. The scholarships instituted by the Government of India seek to remedy this defect. You will be glad to hear that some of the boys and girls who have secured admission to public schools with our scholarships come from families whose monthly income is less than Rs. 100.

Another measure for the equalisation of opportunity is the expansion of the scope of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes scholarships. When I took over charge in 1947, the total amount utilised for all such scholarships was Rs. 3.5 lakhs. It has been my constant aim to increase the provision year by year and you will be glad to hear that in 1954-55 a sum of Rs. 1,07,00,000 is being spent for such scholarships. The number of beneficiaries under the scheme has increased from 600 in 1947-48 to about 20,000 in 1954-55.

It would take me too long if I were to refer to the many interesting activities initiated and continued by the Department of Archaeology, the Department of Anthropology and the National Archives but I can inform you that they have shared in the general progress of which I have given you a brief report.

One measure of this increased activity in all fields of education is the financial allocation for education in our Central and State budgets. In 1953-54, the Central allotment for education was less than Rs. 8 crore. In 1954-55, the allocation is almost Rs. 20 crore. So far as the Governmental expenditure on education is concerned, the allotment has increased from Rs. 94 crore in 1953-54 to Rs. 112 crore in 1954-55.

There is one other matter to which I would like to refer before I conclude my survey. We all profess our devotion to the ideals which Mahatma Gandhi set before this country and the world but I have to say with regret that our practice does not always conform to our professions. Gandhiji believed in the innate dignity of man and had an equal reverence for all religions. For him, toleration was not a mere negative virtue of bearing with other who differed from him but a positive quality marked by love and reverence for all human beings. It is a matter for regret that these basic human values, which have been proclaimed by all religions and were reiterated by Gandhiji in his life and teachings, do not find a proper place in the curriculum of our institutions. Even where Gandhiji's life and teachings are taught in schools or colleges, the broad humanitarian aspects of his teachings are not always fully stressed. If a person differs from Gandhiji's views and does not accept his teaching, he certainly has the right of saying so. No one, however, has the right of professing to follow him and at the same time leaving out essential

elements of his message. Nevertheless, divergences are to be found in different parts of the country and sometimes greater emphasis is placed on some of the less important aspects of his life and teachings. There is also at times a tendency to idolise him but neglect the real significance of his message.

I feel that the time has come when we should prepare a syllabus of his teachings for the use of educational institutions throughout India. In order to arrive at a uniform and correct interpretation of his message, it is necessary to appoint a small committee of persons who have made a special study of his life and teachings. I am sure this meeting of the Board Will give careful thought to this issue and suggest measures so that the real implications of Gandhiji's teachings are brought vividly home to our rising generations.

Document No. 2

Presidential Speech at the session of I.H.R.C. In Mysore on 25-1-1955

I have pleasure in welcoming you to the 31st Session of the Indian Historical Records Commission.

I am happy that at the invitation of the University of Mysore, this Session is being held in this beautiful city. In the British days, Mysore was in the vanguard of Indian States and marked by a liberal and progressive policy in education, industry and administration. On the attainment of independence, it merged with the Indian Union and immediately took its place among the more progressive and developed units of the nation. I am therefore happy that the Session of the Indian Historical Records Commission has given us an opportunity of visiting this progressive State.

Three years ago, on a similar occasion, I drew your attention to the need of utilising the material in the National Archives for the writing of a new history of the War of Indian Independence of 1857, generally described as the Sepoy Mutiny. I think you will agree with me that no objective history of the struggle has yet been written, though there have been any number of studies, long and short, on the subject. You are aware that after 1857 the nature and scope of this struggle was for a long time the subject of controversy both in and outside India. Many books have been written from different angles and even if we consider the work of only recognised historians, the number of such studies can be counted in hundreds. It is, however, clear that they are all written from one point of view, viz., that of the British. They all seek to represent this struggle as a rebellion of the Indian Army against the constitutional Government of the day. Some Indian States also joined in the revolt but these were States which nursed a grievance because of their annexation by Lord Dalhousie. The British Government, as the constituted authority of the land, suppressed the revolt and restored law and order. Not one of the many books written on the subject has sought to interpret the events of 1857 in any other way. It may also be mentioned that while these authors describe in detail the many atrocities perpetrated by

Indians on European men, women and children, not one has referred to the equal or worse crimes against Indians committed by the British.

It is now a general practice that official records are thrown open to research workers after about 50 years. This custom grew out of a decision of the United Kingdom about the records of the wars with Napoleon. Other countries of Europe also accepted this convention. 1908 marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Mutiny. With the approach of this year, the Government of India decided to release for research all official papers connected with it and desired that a history of 1857 should be written on their basis. A three-volume history, based on official records, was published in due course.

The history has the same point of view as those written by other British authors. Only one new point came out in this publication. The author stated that so far as Oudh was concerned, the struggle had in it elements of a national uprising. Oudh had only recently been taken over by the British from an Indian King, and the people were resentful of this. They therefore felt justified in fighting the Company which had acted unjustly towards Oudh. This was, however, not a new discovery. Lord Canning, in his own despatches, had admitted that the struggle in Oudh had partaken of the nature of a national uprising. Since Lord Canning had himself stated this, the author of the book found no difficulty in saying so. The author has also pointed out that the lenient treatment meted out to the Taluqdars of Oudh after the suppression of the Mutiny was due to a recognition of this fact.

For some time past, I have felt that the time has come to write a new and objective history of the Movement of 1857. Three years ago when I spoke to you, I had this issue in my mind. Some months ago it suddenly occurred to me that 1954 was drawing to a close and in two years more we should have the centenary of the uprising. The first shots of the Mutiny were fired on May 10, 1857. There can therefore be no better occasion than May 10, 1957, to bring out a comprehensive history of the struggle.

I therefore decided that the work should immediately be taken in hand. You will be glad to hear that the Government of India have commissioned Dr. S.N. Sen, a well-known Indian historian, formerly Director of the National Archives and for some time Vice-Chancellor of Delhi University, to write this book. It is my purpose that his work should be completed in such time as to publish the book on May 10, 1957.

I wish to make it clear that it will be a true history of the struggle of 1857, and not any partisan interpretation of the events. It must be based on facts and facts alone, and these facts must be collected from the records which we have in the Archives or elsewhere. The Government of India have therefore placed at Dr. Sen's disposal all records on this subject in the National Archives. It is also proposed to make available to him necessary data from the India Office in London.

I realise how difficult it is to write an objective account of events which have aroused so much passion in the past. It is not easy for an individual to hold the balance even, as he is influenced by personal, racial or national feeling. Nevertheless, this must be his constant endeavour if he is to be a historian in the true sense. I also concede that an objective history of the Mutiny was even more difficult to write before India became free. There are two factors which make the task more feasible today. The events we are to study are already a hundred years old. The poignancy which attached to them when they were fresh has been largely lost. We can look today on the hates and strifes of the actors with the detachment born out of distance in time. In addition, the incentive to make political capital out of these far-off events is gone. The political problem between India and Britain has been resolved, and resolved through negotiation and agreement which have created a new feeling of friendship between the two countries. The bitterness which characterised Indo-British relations in the past is no more. There is therefore an atmosphere today in which the events of 1857 can be studied dispassionately and objectively and without seeking to condemn or condone the faults of either party to the struggle.

It is noteworthy that no Indian of that period has written anything which can be regarded as an account of the struggle from the Indian point of view; but if we think over the matter, this is not surprising. We know that the struggle was suppressed with great violence and for many years there was an atmosphere of terror in the country. Thousands were executed without trial. There was hardly any region in Northern India where corpses, hanging from gibbets, did not remind people of the vengeance of the Government. No Indian thus dared at that time to speak or write freely about the events of 1857. A few Indians who were servants or supporters of the Government have left some accounts but nobody who wanted to write freely and frankly had the courage to do so.

Evidence of how the Indian mind was terrorised is clear from the case of one man, Mirza Mohiuddīn. He was a Sub-Inspector of Police

in the suburbs of Delhi during the Mutiny. He fled to Persia and returned after two years. At the request of Mr. Metcalf, whose life he had saved during the Mutiny, he wrote an account of his experiences but handed over the manuscript to Mr. Metcalf on the express condition that it must not be published so long as he was alive. There is hardly one word against the Government in his book which only describes how he himself fared during the Mutiny, but even then the fear which possessed him was so great that it was only under the condition mentioned above that he would hand over the manuscript to Mr. Metcalf. Metcalf kept his word and prepared an English translation of the book only after he heard of Moinuddin's death. The book could not, however, be published during Metcalf's life.

The question has often been asked as to who were responsible for the Mutiny. Suggestions have also been made sometimes that there was a group of planners who prepared a scheme according to which the movement was launched. I must confess that I have grave doubts on the point. During the Mutiny and in the Year immediately thereafter the British Government carried out careful enquiries into the origin and causes of the Mutiny. Lord Salisbury said in the House of Commons that he for one was not prepared to admit that such a widespread and powerful movement could take place on an issue like the greased cartridge. He was convinced that there was more in the Mutiny than appeared on the surface. The Government of India as well as the Government of the Punjab appointed several Commissions and Boards to study this question, and all the legends and rumours current in those days were carefully examined. There was the story about the circulation of messages through *chapatis*. There was also the prophecy that British rule in India would last only a hundred years and would come to an end in June 1857, one hundred years after the Battle of Plassey. In spite of the long and searching enquiry, there is so far no evidence that the Mutiny had been pre-planned or that the army and the Indian people had entered into a conspiracy to overthrow the Government. I find it somewhat difficult to believe that the research we are now undertaking will throw new light on this issue.

During the trial of Bahadur Shah efforts were made to prove that he was a party to a pre-planned conspiracy. The evidence which was adduced did not convince even the British officers who conducted the trial and will be dismissed as frivolous by any man of commonsense. In fact, the course of the trial made it clear that the Mutiny was as much a surprise to Bahadur Shah as to the British.

Some Indians have written on the struggle in the early years of this century. If the truth is to be told, we have to admit that they are not history but mere political propaganda. These authors wanted to represent the Mutiny as a planned war of independence organised by the nobles of India against the British Government. They have also tried to paint certain individuals as the organisers of the revolt. It has been said that Nana Rao, the successor to the last Peshwa Baji Rao, was the master mind behind the Mutiny and established contacts with all Indian military establishments. As evidence of this, it is said that Nana Rao went to Lucknow and Ambala in March and April 1857, and the Mutiny started in May 1857. I think, you will agree, that this can hardly be regarded as conclusive evidence. The mere fact that Nana Rao toured Lucknow and Ambala some time before the Mutiny cannot be regarded as evidence that he planned it.

How baseless some of these conjectures are is clear when we find that these historians regard Ali Naqi Khan, the Wazir of Oudh, as one of the conspirators. Any one who has made a study of the history of Oudh will regard this suggestion as ridiculous. Ali Naqi Khan was completely a henchman of the East India Company. He was the man whom the British used to try to persuade Wajid Ali Shah to give up his kingdom voluntarily. General Outram, the British Resident, had promised generous rewards to Ali Naqi Khan if he succeeded in his mission. Ali Naqi Khan was so persistent in his efforts that Wajid Ali Shah's mother became apprehensive that he might secure his end by subterfuge. She therefore took the State seal in her own possession, kept it in the Zenana and issued orders that it should not go out without her orders. All these facts are well known in Lucknow and people there regard Ali Naqi Khan as a traitor. To suggest that such a man was one of the master minds behind the Mutiny is on the face of it absurd.

It has also been said of Munshi Azimulla Khan and Rangu Babu that they had prepared the plans for the uprising. Azimulla Khan was the agent of Nanarao and had been sent by him to London to plead his cause and secure for him the pension paid to Bajirao. On his way back to India, he had visited Turkey where he had met Omar Pasha on the battlefield of Crimea. Similarly, Rangu Babu had gone to appeal against another decision of Dalhousie regarding the incorporation of Satara into British India.

The fact that they had both been in London on such missions is regarded as pointing to their participation in the conspiracy. It is, however, clear that such suppositions are not evidence. Besides, even if

they had talked about these matters in London, this could not by itself justify us in describing them as architects of the revolt unless we can connect them with the events in India. There is no evidence of such connection, and in the absence of records or testimony we cannot regard them as having planned the Mutiny. After the capture of Cawnpore, the British secured possession of all the papers of Nanarao. The papers of Azimullah Khan also came into their possession. Among his papers, there was a letter addressed to but never sent to Omar Pasha, informing him that Indian soldiers had revolted against the British. Neither this letter nor any other paper of Azimullah Khan gives any indication that he had at any time prepared plans for any uprising in India.

In the light of the evidence we are therefore forced to the conclusion that the Indian Mutiny was not the result of careful planning nor were there any master-minds behind it. What happened was that in the course of a hundred years the Indian people developed a distaste for the Company's rule and gradually realised that power had been captured by a foreign race. As this realisation became widespread, the conditions were created for an outburst which was due not to the conspiracy of a few individuals or groups but growing discontent of the entire people.

If it be asked why the revolt of the Indian people was delayed for almost a hundred years, the explanation may be found in the following facts. The growth of British power in India has perhaps no parallel in history. It was not a case of outright conquest of one country by another, but a story of slow penetration in which the people of the land themselves helped the intruders. The fact that the invasion of the British into India was not in the name of the Crown helped to conceal the true nature of their activities. If the British Crown had from the beginning taken any direct part in Indian affairs, the Indians would have realised that a foreign power was entering the country. Because it was a trading Company, they did not think of it as a potential ruler. It also enabled the agents of the Company to behave in a way which no agent of the Crown could have done. An agent of the British Crown would have felt some hesitation in kowtowing to princelings and local potentates or officers of the Moghul Court. The agents of the Company had no such scruples. They bowed to the pettiest officials with the same readiness as any Indian trader. They indulged in bribery and corruption without any fear of being pulled up by their own Ruler.

It is also noteworthy that for a long time the Company never acted in its own name. It always sided with some local chiefs in order to

advance its own interests. Thus the Company established its position in the South by supporting the claims of the Nawab of Arcot. Similarly in Bengal, it acted in the name and under the authority of the Nawab Nazim of Murshidabad. even after the Company became the virtual ruler of Bengal, it did not claim sovereignty. Clive approached the Emperor for the grant of Diwani rights and for decades the Company also followed the conventions of the other Subedars and Governors of the Provinces. These Governors in Provinces had their own seals, but always described themselves as the servants of the Moghul Emperor. The Governor-General of the Company also had his own seal, but described himself as the servant of Shah Alam, the Emperor of Delhi. The other Governors and Subedars waited on the Emperor in audience, made presents to him and received in return rewards from the Emperor. The Governor-General also waited on the Emperor and made a *nazar* of 101 guineas. In return the Emperor gave him a *Khilat* and titles, and these titles were used by the Governor-General in all official documents. In this way the appearance of the sovereignty of the Emperor was kept up, and the people did not realise how the Company was gradually becoming the real ruler of the land.

This process continued till about the second decade of the 19th century. By that time the rule of the Company had spread up to Sutlej. The Governor-General of the day, Lord Hastings, felt that the time had come to assert his power and gradually disown the Emperor. His first move was to request the Emperor that he should be allowed to sit down during his audience with the Emperor. He also asked for an exemption from the payment of a *nazar* The Emperor rejected these requests, and, for the time being, the Governor-General did not press the point.

The Company then sought to undermine the power of the Emperor by encouraging the growth of a kingdom independent of Delhi. An approach was made to the Nizam of Hyderabad to declare himself a king. The Nizam did not agree, but the British found a more willing agent in the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh. Oudh thus ceased to be a province of the empire and became a kingdom disowning its allegiance to the Emperor.

By 1835, the Company felt strong enough to strike coins in which the Emperor's name was left out. This came to many people as a shock. They realised that from being mere traders or agents of the Emperor, the Company had, in fact, become the ruler of vast territories in India. 1835 also saw a decision to replace Persian by English as the language of the Court. All these had a cumulative effect and made the people

alive to the change in the status of the Company. The shock of the discovery created a great disturbance in their minds and affected not only the civil population but also members of the armed forces. It was this simmering discontent which ultimately broke out in the outburst of 1857.

The growing discontent was aggravated by two measures which may be regarded as immediately responsible for the outburst in 1857. One of these was the new policy which was initiated by Mr. Thompson, Lt.-Governor of the North-West Province (afterwards Agra and Oudh). At first, the Company had favoured a policy of maintaining or creating a class of land-lords who would be natural allies of the Government. Thompson was of a different view. He believed that the existence of big nobles and landlords could be a source of danger to the Company. He was therefore of the view that the landlords, as a class, should be eliminated and the Government should establish direct contact with the ryots. As a result of this new policy, the Company used every possible plea to dispossess nobles and landlords and bring their tenants directly under it.

The second and perhaps decisive factor was Dalhousie's policy by which he incorporated into British territory one Indian State after another. India was at that time passing through the last phase of feudalism. Under the feudal system, loyalty was to the immediate superior who was a landlord or a noble. There was no sense of allegiance to the nation or country. When people saw that the Indian States were being liquidated one after another and landlords were being eliminated as a class, it came as a great shock to them. They felt that the Company was at last showing itself in its true colours and seeking to change the very structure of Indian social and political life. The discontent reached its peak when Oudh was taken over by the Company. Oudh was a State which, for 70 years, had been a faithful ally of the Company. Never once during its connection had Oudh acted against its interest. When in spite of this, the King was forced to abdicate and the State taken over by the Company, the people received a rude shock.

The effect of the dissolution of the Kingdom of Oudh was the greater as a large proportion of the soldiers in the Bengal Army was from this area. They had served the Company faithfully and been one of the major factors leading to the extension of its sway in the land. They suddenly realised that the power which the Company had acquired through their service and sacrifice was utilised to liquidate their own

king. I have little doubt in my mind that 1856, when Oudh was annexed, marked the beginning of a rebellious mood in the army generally and in the Bengal Army in particular. It was from this time that they began to think that the Company's rule must be brought to an end. During the Mutiny, Lawrence and others who sought to find out the feelings of the ordinary sepoy have left ample evidence in support of this view. The affair of the greased cartridge did not create a new cause of discontent in the Army, but supplied the occasion for under-ground discontent to come out in the open.

Though the work of writing this history has been entrusted to Dr. S.N. Sen, it is obvious that the entire work of searching and examining the records in the Archives and elsewhere cannot be done by him single-handed. I would therefore give him full freedom to utilise the services of research scholars and staff to help him in this task, and I will, if necessary, create some special research scholarships for this purpose. We will also give him such help as he may need to have the records in the United Kingdom properly assessed. If any of you have any special suggestions in this connection or know of any material which may throw light in the matter, I should be grateful if you would get into touch with Dr. Sen. It is my hope that the book will be in your hands on May 10, 1957.

Before I conclude, I would like to make a brief reference to some of the more important activities of the National Archives since the last session of the Commission at Hyderabad. A detailed account will be found in the Director's report but I will make a special mention of the programme of acquiring microfilmed copies of records of Indian interest from various countries. The long-term programme of microfilming government records in our possession is also making steady progress. During the year under review about 3,00,000 pages of the Foreign Department and over 1,50,000 pages of the Home Department Original Consultations have been microfilmed. Important historical manuscripts like the Macartney Papers, the holograph letters of Henry Mayers Hyndman and some Persian, Arabic and Urdu manuscripts have also been acquired. I am also happy to note that the programme of publication has made good progress in the current year and steps have been taken to set up a boiler for the laminating machine which, when in operation, will solve one of the major problems for the preservation of records.

You are aware that we have sanctioned a scheme of six Research Fellowships for post-graduate students at the National Archives of

India. The scholars have begun their work, and I am sure that this aid given by the Government of India will encourage the universities and the State Governments to institute similar fellowships and scholarships to enable an increasing number of students to undertake research in Indian History. I also hope that the example of Madras, West Bengal, Bombay, Punjab, PEPSU and U.P., who have set up their Record Offices on modern lines, will be followed by the other State Governments.

Document No. 3

Written answers of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha on 22-2-1955

(1)

SCHOLARS SENT TO GERMANY UNDER THE INDO-GERMAN INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATION SCHEME

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons sent to Germany so far under the Indo-German Industrial Co-operation Scheme; and

(b) how many of them were sent for training in aluminium industry; and who sponsored them?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) 134

(b) 2; The Aluminium Corporation of India Ltd., Calcutta.

(2)

EXPANSION OF PRIMARY EDUCATION FOR COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of States that have received Central aid for expansion of primary education for the purpose of combating unemployment, so far, during the year 1954-55; and

(b) the extent of aid given to each State during the above period?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

*Amounts sanctioned to various States during 1954-55
for employment of School Teachers*

(a) Twenty-five States.

(b) The following amounts were sanctioned as the Government of India share to the various States during 1954-55 (up to 31st January 1955) for employment of school teachers:

State	Amount Sanctioned in 1954-55 upto 31.3.1955
Part A	
Assam	4,55,838
Bihar	16,09,375
Bombay	69,72,856
Madhya Pradesh	12,67,256
Punjab	30,67,938
Madras	14,35,300
Orissa	8,05,275
U.P.	32,28,537
West Bengal	61,84,035
Andhra	3,60,000
Part B	
Hyderabad	10,50,000
Mysore	2,57,040
Madhya Bharat	4,10,000
PEPSU	14,37,325
Rajasthan	6,00,000
Saurashtra	9,66,000
Travancore-Cochin	3,68,638
Part C	
Ajmer-Merwara	36,108
Bhopal	2,47,500
Coorg	38,000
Delhi	49,938
Vindhya Pradesh	9,84,150
Tripura	3,88,080
Kutch	37,410
Manipur	50,800
Total	3,23,07,399

*These amounts exclude the Social Education portion of the Scheme.

Document No. 4

Written answers of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha on 28-2-1955

ARID ZONE RESEARCH IN INDIA BY UNESCO

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state what work the UNESCO Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research has done in India ever since it was formed?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): The UNESCO Committee on Arid Zone Research, being a purely advisory body to UNESCO, as such, does not do any work in India. On its recommendations, however, assistance has been given to India, the details of which are given in the Statement laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Insofar as India is concerned, UNESCO have implemented the following programme in India, on the recommendations of the UNESCO Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research:

In 1953 Dr. Daya Krishna of Jaswant College, Jodhpur, received financial aid of \$ 2,835 from UNESCO for a study of the habits of wild and domestic animals in the Rajputana desert and their role in the maintenance and spread of desert conditions there. Dr. Krishna's fresh request for further financial assistance from UNESCO for the continuance of the Project is under the consideration of UNESCO. In 1954 UNESCO made available a grant of a sum equivalent to \$ 2,000 each to Prof. Shanti Sarup of Jaswant College, Jodhpur, for a study of the flora of Rajasthan and the preparation of a herbarium and to Dr. Bharucha, of the Institute of Science, Bombay, for a *Phytosociological* study of the vegetation of the Rajasthan Desert.

On the recommendations of the Committee, the Director-General, UNESCO, formed a number of international panels of honorary consultants for the principal fields of Arid Zone Research who are consulted from time to time by correspondence or selected to sit on

Colmmitees convened by UNESCO. The following are the panels:

. Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Biology, Climatology,

Human Ecology and Animal Ecology

Indian scientists are represented on these panels.

The Committee considered various research institutions connected with Arid Zone problems and recommended to UNESCO for grant of Associated Status. Such a status has been given to the Jaswant College, Jodhpur, in India by UNESCO.

The Committee has, from time to time, recommended holding of symposia on various Arid Zone subjects. One such symposium on "Wind, Power and Solar Energy in the Arid Zone in South Asia" was organised in New Delhi in October 1954, by UNESCO in collaboration with the Government of India.

On the recommendations of the Committee UNESCO have collected certain basis data regarding the Arid and semi-Arid areas and also conducted a survey of current research in the field of Arid Zone Plant Ecology. This information has been of use to the technical personnel engaged in Arid Zone research.

Document No. 5

Written answers of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha on 3-3-1955

AMOUNT GRANTED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS BY THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Shri Krishnakant Vyas: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the amount granted by the Education Ministry for scholarships during each of the years 1952-53 and 1953-54; and

(b) the amount disbursed to the persons concerned during the above years?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) The amounts provided in the budget estimates were Rs. 43,69,050 for 1952-53 and Rs. 75,73,203 for 1953-54. Additional amount of Rs. 12,05,915 was found in 1952-53 and Rs. 8,33,919 in 1953-54 by reappropriation.

(b)	1952-53	—	Rs. 55,74,965
	1953-54	—	Rs. 84,07,122

Document No. 6

Written answers of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha on 20-4-1955

REPORTS OF THE SCIENTIFIC MAN-POWER COMMITTEE

Dr. R.P. Dube: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) when the interim and final reports of the Scientific Man-power Committee were received by Government; and

(b) the expenditure incurred so far on the implementation of the recommendation of this Committee?

The Ministry for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) and (b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Part (a) The Interim report was received in August 1947 and the Final report in June 1949.

Part (b) An expenditure of Rs. 53.18 lakhs was incurred on schemes undertaken on the recommendations of the Scientific Man-power Committee, up to 31st March 1951. From that date onwards, the schemes were integrated with the First Five Year Plan and the various recommendations of the Committee, both in the Interim and the Final Reports, were also taken note of in drawing up the Plan. It is therefore not possible to determine the expenditure incurred exclusively on the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee for this period. However, for schemes of Scientific and Technical Education under the Plan, an expenditure of Rs. 879.2 lakhs was incurred during 1951-55.

Document No. 7

Written answers dated 22-4-1955, of Maulana Azad to the question asked in the House of People

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Shri S.C. Samanta: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) when the air-conditioning works of the National Archives commenced;

(b) how far the methods of cleaning, fumigating, repairing and rehabilitating its records have been mechanised up-to-date;

(c) the sources from which the technical equipments have been procured and, at what cost; and

(d) the strength of technical staff appointed since 1949-50 in connection with the preservation and administration of its records scientifically?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) 1954-55.

(b) Cleaning and fumigation methods have been brought up-to-date. In regard to repair and rehabilitation, latest methods are being introduced.

(c) Mostly from U.S.A. at a cost of about Rs. 1,40,000.

(d) 44 (fortyfour).

Document No. 8

Written answers dated 22-4-1955, of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the House of the People

UNEMPLOYMENT

Shri N.B. Chowdhury: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the amount given to the State of West Bengal during 1954-55 under the Scheme to Relieve Educated Unemployment?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): Rs. 65,52,416.

Document No. 9

Written answers dated 26-4-1955, of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the House of the People

TRIBAL EDUCATION

Shri Dasaratha Deb: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tripura Rajya Ganamukti Parishad has submitted a memorandum to the Government of Tripura, for the advancement of Tribal education; and

(b) if so, the steps taken thereon?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The proposal contained in the memorandum in question is under the examination of the Tripura Government.

Document No. 10

Answers of Maulana Azad dated 26-4-1955 to the question¹ asked in the House of People

Shri Sanganna: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state the total number of Voluntary Welfare Organisations in each State, if the information is available?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): The information is not available.

1. About the Volunatry Welfare Organisations.

Document No. 11

**Joint replies of Maulana Azad and His Parliamentary Secretary
to the questions asked in the House of People on
April 29, 1955**

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh : Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the University Grants Commission has finalized the policy and principles on the basis of which grants will be made to Universities; and

(b) if so, what are those principles?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement giving the general principles which have been adopted by the University Grants Commission is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [See Appendix X, annexure No. 2.]

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The first item in the statement mentions "To honour commitments made by the Ministry of Education and to continue to pay grants in accordance with these commitments". May I know on what basis these commitments were made and whether they can be altered if the University Grants Commission find that they are not in accord with the principles which have been laid down generally?

Dr. M.M. Das: The University Grants Commission came into existence only last year. And some of the commitments were made by the Ministry of Education before this Commission came into existence. I do not think there will be any case in which the University Grants Commission will find that the Ministry of Education has made commitments which they may find not possible for them to implement.

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): May I clarify the position. When the University Grants Commission had not been formed, the Ministry of Education itself gave the grants. When this Commission was set up, a few cases in this connection had already been decided. It was decided

then that giving of grants in these cases be also dealt with by the University Grants Commission, as it had already been set up.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh : May I know whether the problem of pay-scale and allowances of college teachers and other employees of colleges has come before the University Grants Commission and if so, whether the Commission has made any recommendations to the Central Government as also to the State Governments and the Universities concerned, in order to bring the pay-scale and allowances according to the recommendations made by the University Grants Commission?

Dr. M.M. Das : So far as the teachers and the professors of the universities are concerned, the University Grants Commission have determined the pay-scales and they have already given grants to the Universities to implement those pay-scales.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee : May I know why, in view of the University Grants Commission Bill being in the Select Committee stage, the Government did not await the report of the Select Committee and legislation to follow, before the principles and policies are finalised?

Maulana Azad : Last year the Government decided that the matter was very urgent. It would take a lot of time if a Bill was introduced and got passed in Parliament. Therefore it was decided that a Commission be set up forthwith and same powers be given to it as are provided in the Bill. Accordingly the Commission was set up and it is working. It is not the intention of the Government that there should be obstacles put in the way of this Commission.

Shri T.K. Chaudhuri : May I know whether the vacancy caused by the death of the Chairman of the University Grants Commission has been filled up or whether it is likely to be filled up soon?

Maulana Azad : Attempt is being made to do it early.

Document No. 12

Oral answers dated 29-4-1955 of Maulana Azad and his Parliamentary Secretary to the questions asked in the House of People

INDIAN MUSEUM

Shri N.B. Chowdhury : Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India contemplate transferring the Indian Museum from Calcutta to Delhi; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

I may add, Sir, that it has never been, nor is it now, the intention of the Government of India to shift the Indian Museum from Calcutta to any other city.

Shri N.B. Chowdhury: May I know whether the Government's attention has been drawn to a detailed report in the *Daily Y ganthar* that certain government officials of the Education Ministry went from Delhi to Calcutta recently to discuss the possibility of transferring the Museum?

Mr. Speaker: That does not arise.

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : This is not correct.

Shri S.C. Samanta : May I know whether any exhibits from the Calcutta Museum have been removed to Delhi; if so, for what purpose and will they be returned?

Maulana Azad : Yes.

Mr. Speaker : Does the hon. Member want to know about exhibits in general or does he want to know about some specific exhibits?

Shri S.C. Samanta : Some exhibits.

Mr. Speaker : Has the hon. Minister any information on the point?

Maulana Azad : Three of its exhibits are still in the Central Museum now.

Document No. 13

Joint answers dated 29-4-1955, of Maulana Azad and his Parliamentary Secretary to the questions asked in the House of People

WHEAT LOAN EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMME

Shri B.N. Misra : Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a team of Librarians has been selected by Government to visit U.S.A. under the Wheat Loan Educational Exchange Programme; and

(b) if so, the names of the Members of the team?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) Twelve Librarians have proceeded to U.S.A.

(b) The names of the Librarians are:

1. Syed Bashiruddin.
2. Shri K.R. Deasi.
3. Shri Nabi Ahmad.
4. Shri Sachidulal Das Gupta.
5. Shri Amar Nath Sharma.
6. Shri B.C. Banerjee.
7. Shri Dines Chandra Sarkar.
8. Shri Pramil Chandra Basu.
9. Shri M.V. Raghuvandra Rao.
10. Shri Subramani Ramabhadran.
11. Dr. Maneck Bapuji Vijifdar.
12. Shri J.S. Anand.

I may add, Sir, that the final selection was made by the Government of the United States of America on the recommendation of the Government of India.

Shri S.N. Das : May I know the names of the libraries from which they have been sent?

Dr. M.M. Das : Syed Bashiruddin from the Muslim University, Aligarh; Shri K.R. Desai, Librarian, Gujarat University; Shri Nabi Ahmad, Secretary, Jamia-Millia Library.....

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : This list is very long. In my opinion it is unnecessary to read it.

Shri B.N. Misra put Supplementary about a book exchange scheme with the United States question in Hind.

Dr. M.M. Das : There is a scheme of 'book exchange' with the United States of America. These institutions have participated in that particular scheme. The Government of India invited names from those institutions who participated in that scheme.

Document No. 14

Written answers dated 29-4-1955, of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to the questions asked in the House of People

SCHOLARSHIPS

Shri Sanganna : Will the Minister of Education be pleased to State:

(a) whether Government are aware that students from the Orissa State studying at present in the Veterinary College of the Punjab State are put to hardship due to irregular payment of Scholarships awarded to them by the Government of India; and

(b) if so, the steps that are being taken in the matter?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) and (b) Only one student from the Orissa State is studying at present in a Veterinary College of the Punjab State who is in receipt of the Government of India scholarship under the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes Scholarships Scheme. His completed application for the scholarship for 1954-55 was received in the Ministry of Education on the 25th November, 1954. The amount of both the instalments of his scholarship was sent to the Principal of his College for disbursement to him in January 1955. There has thus been no delay in making the payment.

Document No. 15

Answers dated 29-4-1955, of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the House of People

YOGIC RESEARCH

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Yogic Research work done by the Kaivalayadham Shreeman Madhava Yoga Mandir Samiti, Lonawala, has been brought to the notice of the people in general; and

(b) if so, in what way?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) and (b) The Government of India have no information.

Document No. 16

Answers dated 29-4-1955, of Maulana Azad, to the questions asked in the House of People

MINISTER'S DISCRETIONARY FUND

Shri S.C. Samanta: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of grants paid out of the Education Minister's Discretionary Fund during 1954-55;

(b) the corresponding amounts in the last three years;

(c) the details of the amounts paid during 1954-55; and

(d) whether there is any surplus amount in hand at the end of 1954-55?

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) Rs. 2,49,575/4/

(b) 1951-52 ... Rs. 1,70,726/-

 1952-53 ... Rs. 1,34,668/-

 1953-54 ... Rs. 2,38,533/8/-

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix XII, annexure No. 29.]

(d) Rs. 424/12/-

Document No.17

Written answers dated 6-9-1955 of Maulana Azad in the Council of States to the questions asked in connection with the loans given by the Ministry of Education

Shri Krishna Kant Vyas : Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

- (a) the names of the institutions which were given interest free loans by the Ministry of Education during 1953-1954 and 1954-55;
- (b) the total amount of loans thus given so far; and
- (c) whether the loans given upto 1953 have been recovered and if not, how much of those loans has not been recovered?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a), (b) and (c) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) The following institutions were given loans, without interest, during 1954-55:

1. National Educational Society, Madras.
2. Shri Ramakrishna Ananda Ashram, 24 Parganas, West Bengal.
3. Palli Niketan, Village Bagu, 24 Parganas, West Bengal.
4. Prabhudha Bharat Sangha, P.O. Itachuna, Hooghly, West Bengal.
5. Lok Seva Sibir, Bara Andhulia, Nadia, West Bengal.
6. Nityananda Vidyaratna, Village Erogada, P.O. Parihat, Midnapore, West Bengal.
7. Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya, Coimbatore, Madras.
8. Vidya Bhavan Society, Udaipur, Rajasthan
9. Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
10. Jamia Millia, Delhi.
11. Kashi Vidyapith, Banaras.
12. Aligarh Muslim University.

13. Bengal Engineering College, Sibpur.
14. Ramakrishna Mission Shilpa-Mandir, Belur.
15. Jalpaiguri Polytechnic.
16. M.B.C. Institute of Engineering and Technology, Burdwan.
17. K.G. Engineering Institute, Vishnupur.
18. Hooghly Institute of Technology, Hooghly.
19. Calcutta University.
20. H.R.H. Prince of Wales School, Jorhat.
21. Orissa School of Engineering, Cuttack.
22. Jadavpur Engineering College.
23. Central Technical Institute, Gwalior.
24. Birla Vishwakarma Mahavidyala, Anand.
25. B.V. Bhoomraddi College of Engineering and Technology, Hubli.
26. L.M. College of Pharmacy, Ahmedabad.
27. Sir Cuarow Wadia Institute of Electrical Technology, Poona.
28. Govindram Seksaria Technological Institute, Indore.
29. Nagpur University.
30. Madras Institute of Technology, Madras.
31. A.C. College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikudi.
32. P.S.G. & Sons' Charities College of Technology, Coimbatore.
33. Osmania University Engineering College, Hyderabad.
34. College of Engineering, Trivandurum.
35. Polytechnic Institute, Kalmassary.
36. Maharaja's Technical Institute, Trichur.
37. Guru Nanak Engineering College, Ludhiana.
38. Vishwakarma Polytechnic Phagwara.
39. Hewett Engineering School, Lucknow.
40. Civil Engineering School, Lucknow.
41. Roorkee University, Roorkee.
42. Dayalbagh Engineering College, Agra.
43. Vanasthali Vidyapith, Rajasthan.

(b) The total amount of loans given is Rs. 65,74,754.

(c) Some part of the loans has been realised. The balance outstanding is Rs. 62,15,927.

Document No. 18

Answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in the Council of States (Rajya Sabha)

CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES OF DISPLACED PERSONS

Maulana M. Faruqi : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to State:

(a) whether pending applications for the issue of duplicate copies of the certificates and degrees from displaced persons who lost or misplaced their original certificates and degrees during the disturbances of 1947, have since been disposed of on both sides in pursuance of the joint communique issued by the Government of India and Pakistan on the subject in May 1955;

(b) if not, what is the present position with regard to these applications; and

(c) how many fresh applications on the subject have been received by both Governments after the issue of the said communique?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) and (b) No Sir; ratification of the agreement by the Government of Pakistan is still awaited.

(c) 45 fresh applications have been received from Indian nationals. We are not aware of the number of applications received by the government of Pakistan from their nationals.

Document No. 19

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN INDIAN UNIVERSITIES

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the expenditure incurred by Government on scholarships given to foreign students studying in India in 1954; and

(b) how many of them were boys?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) : (a) Rs. 9,01,583-12-7.

(b) 349.

Document No. 20

Written answers of Maulana Azad dated 6-9-1955 to the questions asked by Mr. M. Valiulla in Rajya Sabha in connection with the presentation of books to foreign countries

Mr. M. Valiulla : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of books presented to Foreign Governments or libraries by the government of India From January, 1955 onwards; and

(b) the number of Books received from Foreign Governments by the Government of India or Indian libraries during the same period?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) : (a) 419.

(b) 6,809.

Document No. 21

**Written answers, dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

TRAINING CENTRES FOR BASIC EDUCATION

Shri Krishnakant Vyas : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of training centres of Basic Education opened in the Centrally administered areas from the year 1951 to 1954; and

(b) the number of persons trained at these Centres during the same period?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) and (b) The requisite information has been called for from the Centrally administered areas and will be placed on the Table of the House when received.

Document No. 22

Answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad in the Council of State to the questions asked in Hindi by Mr. Krishnkant Vyas¹ about the production of cheap audio-visual aids

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): A unit for research and production of non-projected visual aids has been set up in the Ministry of Education. The unit will take up the preparation of non-projected visual aids useful in (i) Social Education, and (ii) Secondary Education.

Mr. Vyas asked to Maulana Azad to state the steps that were being taken by government to meet the storage of cheap Audio-visual aids made from Indian material for educational purposes.

Document No. 23

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Dr. Raghbir Singh : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of scholarships awarded for the study of foreign languages so far during the year 1955-56;

(b) the total amount provided for the year for each scholarship; and

(c) the language-wise and country-wise break-up of the number of scholarships awarded?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) Selections for 1955-56 have not so far been made.

(b) and (c) A statement giving relevant information is laid on the Table of the House.

Document No. 24

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

ALL INDIA FEDERATION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the All India Federation of Educational Associations has requested Government to set up a Grants Commission for Secondary Education on the lines of the University Grants Commission; and

(b) if so, what is the reaction of Government in the matter?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) : (a) No. Sir,

(b) Does not arise.

Document No. 25

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

IMAGE OF CHALUKYAS PERIOD

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether an image believed to belong to the days of the Chalukyas over a thousand years ago has recently been acquired by the Department of Archaeology; and

(b) if so, where image will be kept?

The Minister for Education and Natural Research and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) National Museum.

Document No. 26

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

HINDI EXHIBITION

Shri M. Valiulla: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Hindi Exhibition was held in New Delhi in August 1955;

(b) whether there is a proposal to hold such exhibitions all over the country; and

(c) if so, whether any new items are proposed to be added to the future exhibitions; and what will be those new items ?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

(c) The question of adding new items to future exhibitions will be decided after a decision has been arrived at on the exhibitions being taken round the country.

Document No. 27

**Written answers dated 6-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

UNESCO FELLOWSHIP SCHEMES

Maulana M. Faruqi : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of foreign scholars who came to India for study tours, training and research work in Indian universities under the United Nations' Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation Fellowship Schemes in 1954-55; and

(b) how many Indian nationals availed of fellowships awarded under the UNESCO Exchange of Persons Programme for studies abroad during the same period?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) : (a) Three.

(b) One.

Document No. 28

**Written answers dated 19-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

TEXT BOOKS SCRUTINISED BY THE CENTRAL BUREAU OF TEXT-BOOK RESEARCH

Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan : Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of text-books scrutinised by the Central Bureau of Text-Book Research so far; and

(b) the amount spent so far on this Bureau?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) : (a) The number of text-books analysed so far by the Central Bureau to Text-Book Research is 443.

(b) A sum of approximately Rs. 82,000 has been spent on the Bureau so far.

Document No. 29

**Written answers, dated 19-9-1955, of Maulana Azad
to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

MINES AND MINERALS (REGULATION AND DEVELOPMENT) ACT, 1948

Maulana M. Farqui : Will the Minister for Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided to replace the existing Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1948 by two separate Acts for (i) Mines and Minerals, and (ii) Oilfields and Mineral Oil Resources; and

(b) if so, when the proposed legislation is to be brought before the Parliament?

The Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): (a) and (b) Yes Sir. The Bills will be introduced in the Parliament in the near future.

Document No. 30

Written answers, dated 19-9-1955, of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha in connection with the National Metallurgical Laboratory, Jamshedpur

Mr. T. Bodra: 'Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of persons belonging to the Scheduled castes and Scheduled tribes at present employed in the National Metallurgical Laboratory, Jamshedpur; and

(b) their present scales of pay?

Minister for Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Abul Kalam Azad) : (a) and (b) A statement giving the information is attached.¹

1. See Appendix X, annexure No. 98 (Rajya Sabha Debates 1955).

PART-II

Document No. 31

U.G.C. BILL

Further discussion on the University Grants Commission Bill, presented in the House of the People by Dr. M.M. Das, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, dated 28-2-1955

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion on the motion for reference of the University Grants Commission Bill to a Joint Committee.¹

As the House is aware, six hours have been allotted for the discussion on this motion. Out of this, three hours and 25 minutes have already been taken on the 22nd February and only two hours and 35 minutes now remain. This would mean that the discussion on this motion will conclude at about 2.35 p.m. when the motion will be put to the vote of the House. Thereafter, the House will take up the consideration of the Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1954, for which 1½ hours have been allotted. After the disposal of this Bill, the Dentists (Amendment) Bill will be taken up.

At 5 p.m. today, the Minister of Finance will present the Budget.

What time will the hon. Parliamentary Secretary require for replying?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): I will take about 40 minutes. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: He has to be given some time after having heard for five hours all that the Members have to say. Perhaps he will try to reply

1. When the Bill was presented in the House on 20.2.1954 a motion to refer this Bill to a Joint Committee was placed

to each and every point. I leave it to him; he will take as short a time as possible and try to curtail. When 40 minutes remain, he will be called upon to reply.

I think before the presentation of the Budget, the House would like to rise for some time. What time will suit?

Shri A.M. Thomas (Ernakulam): 4.30 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: Originally the proposal was to rise for 15 minutes. I think that is too short a time. The House will rise at 4.30 and re-assemble at 5 P.M. That will leave enough time.

Shri S.S. More (Sholapur): On the last occasion when we dispersed, I was trying to make out the point that the constitutional propriety of this measure was open to very serious question. Under item 11 of the State List, all education, including university education, is to be within the competence of the States themselves. But there are some exceptions — some circumscribing exceptions — and I would say that entries Nos. 63, 64, 65 and 66 of List I have to be taken into consideration when the Central Government try to assume some control over this sort of education. Now entry No. 66 says that the Central Government can pass a measure for the purpose of prescribing standards or for the purpose of co-ordination, but the present measure, which appears to be a measure for the purpose of setting up standards, determining standards, and for the purpose of co-ordination is really meant to be a Bill coming under entry No. 63. According to entry No. 63, the three Central Universities are under the entire control of the Central Government, and in addition to these three Central Universities, other institutions which might be declared by Parliament to be of national importance may also come under the controlling influence of the Central Government, apart from the influence of the State Governments. But pretending to act or pretending to legislate under entry 66, an attempt is being made to circumvent the province of this Parliament to declare any institution as a national institution and control is being assumed on all the remaining Universities so that the remaining 28 Universities will be reduced to the position of the three Central Universities. That is my contention.

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN *in the Chair*]

If we take clause 14: consequences of failure of Universities to comply with recommendations of the Commission, this is the penal clause of the measure. Just as we have got preventive detention, now, as far as Universities are concerned, this clause is about preventive

withdrawal of grants or withholding of grants, and therefore to that extent, it is a sort of police clause in this measure. This clause, I fear, will be utilised by Government and the Central Commission for the purpose of tightening their grip over all Universities. All the Universities suffer from a sort of financial anaemia; they suffer from want of funds, and in their need to have more funds from the Central Government, they will be forced with a bludgeon of uniformity to abide by directives which might be illegal as far as the Universities are concerned. To cut the argument short, I feel that this measure offends against provincial autonomy. Not only that; it goes further. Just as one can kill two birds with one stone, with this one measure Government are violating two kinds of autonomy – provincial autonomy as well as autonomy of Universities. Universities in this country have a long and glorious history. Private members and private academicians, without any strings, have done their best at tremendous cost to themselves to develop these Universities on right lines.

But now this Government, out to centralise all power, are trying to put their thumb in the pot of jam of Universities autonomy. My contention is that it is the business of this House and it is in the interest of the country that we should strive to safeguard the autonomy of Universities. I may say that even the Radhakrishnan Commission, which recommended that such a thing ought to be done, have referred to one of the resolutions of the Sixth Quinquennial Conference of the Inter-University Board – I am referring to page 450 of the Report of the University Education Commission. The concluding portion of the resolution which is given there reads:

“While appreciating the policy of the Government of India and the Provincial Governments to assist the growth and expansion of university education by financial grants, this conference places on records its emphatic opinion that the autonomy and independence of the universities receiving such grants should not in any way be interfered with.”

Putting its seal of approval, this is what the Commission says:

“We feel that the autonomy of the independent Universities in general is a matter which should be the concern not merely of the Universities but of the Governments and of the public in general. Universities can play a great role only if it is appreciated both by the public and the Government that they function as autonomous units and are free to develop along well-established standards uncontrolled and uninfluenced by the changing waves of democratic passion. At the same time, it must be emphasised that the autonomy claimed by the University

should be understood as implying a greater amount of self-control and self-discipline and a sincere desire to work for the higher standards of intellectual integrity and morality.”

My submission is that this Bill is not conceived with a view to implementing faithfully and in all its spirit this particular observation of the Radhakrishnan Commission. On the contrary, I fear that this clause 14 has been put into this Bill for the sinister purpose of having a whip hand in this matter. This will be used as a sort of whip chord for the purpose of driving the Universities in a particular direction in which the Government – the Executive Government of this country – desire them to move. We should all resist that.

Then, another point that I want to make is this. Is there any necessity for any such statutory body? Take, for instance, the United Kingdom. There, the University Grants Committee is a non-statutory body. It is a completely advisory body and with all its advisory capacity that body is doing the greatest service for the purpose of education, because it is not central direction which is needed most but is the central funds which are needed most for the purpose of taking the Universities to their proper destination. But, in spite of that fact, we are not importing British precedent here and we are trying to bring into existence a statutory body with Draconic powers. Is there any necessity for such an organisation? That is my relevant question.

There are already in the field similar institutions. Take, for instance, the Inter-University Board. It is a non-official organisation in which all the Universities participate and this Board attends to all the common difficulties and tries to bring about in a non-official way some uniformity. In addition to that, there is the Central Advisory Board of Education. That also is a useful body, partly elected, and that Board also, in its different meetings, does give some useful guidance as far as University Education is concerned. In addition to these two bodies, there is already another institution, the Universities Grants Commission, which was brought into existence by a Government Resolution in 1945 and its ambit was expanded by some orders in 1946 and 1947. When all these institutions are there, I do not see why there should be another statutory body called the Universities Grants Commission. This Government seems to have a very undesirable craving for multiplying bodies and creating different jobs for the purpose of distributing patronage. My submission is that such a body is not necessary. It will be giving a sort of control over the life and the doings of the Universities, which in the name of uniformity, will kill their initiative, which will not take notice

of the different stages or the different strata of society or their different needs in the vast country. Nobody should try to sit at Delhi with a bludgeon in his hand and try to induce everybody or force everybody to adopt certain standards which are conceived here, but which cannot be translated into reality if we go to the States and see the different conditions prevailing there.

What is the real need? If Government is really sincere in their desire to give some impetus to University education what is needed is not apparent miserable co-ordination without any funds from the Central Government. In the financial statement an allotment has been shown. At page 10 of this Bill, it has been stated that Rs. 1,50,000 will be required for the purpose of the University Grants Commission Establishment and only Rs. 1,79,62,000 are to be paid for the purpose of education. Will that be enough? If I can speak from memory, our Universities are spending more than Rs. 17 crores for the purpose of education, and in spite of that fact, what is the proportion which the Government bears of this educational expenditure? I am quoting from Education in India, 1950-51, page 136. The direct expenditure on Universities and Colleges of States has been shown and we find that though some of the B Class States are rising to their responsibilities, some of the A Class States are the worst sinners in this respect. Take, for instance, the Bombay State. Only 37.7 per cent. of the expenditure is given by them as State Grant or Central Grant. There are some other States. In Punjab it is 31.13. I am not finding the time to go through the whole table. But, you will find that in the Hyderabad State, 94.2 is the percentage of Government expenditure on this University and College education.

Dr. M.M. Das: In what year, please?

Shri S.S. More: In 1950-51; I was told that this is the latest report available to us. We are lagging in everything, in collecting up-to-date data also. That is the misfortune of our state of administration. This Government is trying to take up a more profitable pattern by operating with only Rs. 1,79,62,000. It is just like a bundle of grass dangled before the proverbial donkey. My submission is that the Government is not doing its duty. The Britisher in the past did make a sort of attempt to introduce uniformity. I have not the time to refer to other reports. But, with your permission, I may quote from the Report of 1902. It was the Reilly Commission. The Commission was directed to enquire into the conditions and prospects of the Universities established in British India, to consider and report upon any proposals which have been or

may be made for improving their constitution and working and to recommend to the Governor-General-in-Council such measures as may tend to lift the standard of university teaching and to promote the advancement of learning. This Commission went in detail into all the aspects of university education, the examiners, the professors, their standards, how examinations should be held, what books should be prescribed and every minute matter which pertains to the sphere of university education came under their very careful and exhaustive scrutiny. For anyone who is interested in this matter, this report will be a sort of mine of information and useful suggestions. But, this Commission also came to the conclusion.....

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to take as little time as possible because there are many speakers who propose to speak.

Shri S.S. More: I propose to be as brief as possible and I do not want to stand in the way of others.

I am referring to a very important point. This Government seems to have that complacent idea that it has for the first time realised the necessity of co-ordination and setting up of standards. Let us go to the Report of 1902, that is more than half a century old, and in para. 194 on page 54 of the Report, it is stated:

“In concluding the section of our Report which deals with financial questions it seems necessary to point out that the acceptance of our recommendations must inevitably lead to increased expenditure in many directions. While we hope that in many parts of India they will furnish an opportunity to public-spirited and generous benefactors of education, we trust that Government may not be unwilling to reconsider the scale on which it supports and aids the various colleges on which to so large an extent will depend the accomplishment of the reforms that have been sketched in this Report. We have laid down standards of college efficiency and equipment considerably in advance of those hitherto accepted and any such change in our college system will impose upon the Universities also corresponding duties in relation to examinations, control of colleges, and the provision of the means of post-graduate instruction in certain departments. These reforms, if they are to be carried out on the lines indicated in our Report, must mean an increase of both college and university expenditure.”

This expenditure, even this Report visualised, must come mainly from the coffers of the Central Government or the State Governments

and they realise that such useful suggestions for improving the standard cannot be given effect to simply if they rely on private bounty or the dwindling resources of fees with the growing poverty of the peasantry. Therefore, my submission is that Government do not seem to be very serious about their responsibility. The Radhakrishnan Commission, on page 455 of its Report, pointed out what will be the approximate expenditure if some of the recommendations were to be given effect to:

“For the next quinquennium the total annual expenditure on these heads will be.....”

and after enumerating the heads and the expenditure desired on each one of these heads, they came to the conclusion that a solid figure of Rs. 21,48,75,000 will be required. They further recommended:

“Of this roughly 60 per cent. will have to be provided by the Government (Central and Provincial) and this amounts to Rs. 8,69,25,000 recurring and Rs. 4,20,00,000 non-recurring.”

Thus, Rs. 8,69,25,000 was the annual recurring expenditure to be provided by Government and Rs. 4,20,00,000 for the purpose of non-recurring grants for a period of five years. In the face of this recommendation, they pretend that they have brought in this Bill for the purpose of implementing the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission, but they are giving effect to half – the unimportant half – of what was recommended by the Radhakrishnan Commission, because in this very recommendation they have stated on page 455:

“that the State should recognise its responsibility for the financing of higher education;”

That part is absolutely ignored by Government, and out of these six recommendations, they only accept by putting in this Bill that the University Grants Commission be set up for allocating grants. Six particulars are given, and out of the six, five are safely ignored by Government and particularly that for financing education by the States and the Central Government, and only the last item, which refers to the appointment of the University Grants Commission, has been accepted. If the Commission's recommendation has to be accepted, it must be accepted in its full spirit. It is no use complying with some small part of the letter and telling the House “We are implementing it”. This is not only distortion of the Commission's recommendations – gross distortion – but it is unfair to the Commission itself because you tear out only one part of their recommendation which has to be viewed in the perspective of the whole picture and then ignore the remaining part. For these

reasons, I feel that we must oppose this Bill. I also feel that our university education stands to run into greater danger if this power is handed over to the executive government. The executive government during the past never struck any original path and it was left to private institutions to create new precedents and to lay down new principles. I will take only one instance. It is the sponsors of the national education who were fighting the Britishers and who were not supported by the Britishers because the national education could not be made to fit in with their bureaucratic pattern of education. It is the sponsors of the national education, it is the supporters and promoters of private institutions who have given not only their thought but even their blood for the purpose of giving a particular shape and form to the national education. In this country the people who go to the university are almost negligible in number because the rich are becoming negligible in number though their financial influence is becoming a major factor, and I would say that the peasantry and the toilers, though numerically, as far as counting of heads is concerned, they constitute the majority of the country, are the most ignored minorities from the point of education, from the point of social amenities and from the point of happiness, and if any weightage has to be given to any minority – we were talking about Jinnah's plan and other plans and we are very profuse with our plans to give weightage to minorities – it should be given to the minority of the toilers and the minority of the poor middle-class people, who have been really suffering under the dispensation of the present Government. This Government is out for a socialistic pattern. I intervened when the Prime Minister was giving us some idea of his socialistic pattern, and I asked him "What are your concrete steps"? He said "thinking". That is his first step and possibly "thinking" would be his last step also.

Shri M.D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): Correct thinking.

Shri S.S. More: Mere thinking is not sufficient; concrete steps are needed. Merely preparing a menu for a sumptuous dinner is not enough; you must prepare the dish. As far as this measure is concerned, I humbly submit for the consideration of the House that it is not properly conceived; it will not be doing any useful service to the cause of university education; it might succeed in creating a sort of dead, wooden uniformity, which will not be in the lasting interests of the country, and, therefore, I would say that the attempt on the part of the executive to secure, at the cost of a very paltry sum, sweeping control over the lives of the younger generations of the country ought to be resisted with all the forces that we command.

Shri M.D. Joshi: I rise to welcome this measure.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member to be brief because there are many Members who wish to speak on this measure.

Shri M.D. Joshi: I shall be as brief as possible. This measure should have come long ago, but as the adage goes, it is better late than never. This Bill has been condemned by very many speakers on the opposite side, particularly my hon. friend, Shri More, who delivered his broadside – and he rejoices in delivering broadsides against whatever comes from this side of the House. He has characterised this Bill as a strangulating measure and he said about some of the clauses that they are foolish clauses.

Shri S.S. More: Not foolish, but police.

Shri M.D. Joshi: Whatever he chooses to call it; he will find, however, that the University Grants Commission or a body like this has been recommended by the University Education Commission, which has been quoted by him so copiously. The Radhakrishnan Commission has recommended already that a small body of five or at the most seven members be constituted to effect co-ordination and maintain standards for university education. This Bill seeks to implement what the Radhakrishnan Commission wanted, and therefore, I am at a loss to understand the very strong objection taken by my hon. friend there. But I can understand the object of their objection, because the Opposition Members do not want any sort of control on the part of the Government over institutions. Only two days back, we had the spectacle of a resolution about the broadcasting corporation put forth by an hon. Member from the Opposition Benches. There it was said that there should be no control by Government on any of these institutions. Well, I am unable to appreciate this kind of reasoning. Our nation is engaged in the great task of rebuilding our society on a new pattern. Government must have in mind certain programmes. It has a Five Year Plan and therefore it has to proceed along certain lines. It is no use saying that formerly our institutions proceeded on private enterprise and that formerly they used to oppose the British imperialists. It is all very well. It was our business then, when there was foreign domination, to see that all our institutions and our younger generation had to grow in a spirit of revolt against foreign domination. It was all very well then to oppose Government, but now, when the Government is there established by the popular vote, it is ununderstandable on anybody's part – be he from this side of the House or that side of the House – that the good measures of Government should be opposed even by educative bodies.

We have this sight: on the one hand, all Opposition Members condemning outright any measure of Government, and we have the other specimen: in this morning's papers there is a report in which the Chief Minister of an important State – Mysore – has given vent to a feeling and to an idea with which it is difficult to express one's agreement. I shall, for the information of the House, read one or two lines. He said:

“The idea of giving autonomy to the Universities was a feudal one which originated in England at a time when Universities were more or less private enterprises conforming to a policy of *laissez faire*. These are days of planning and socialism, and central control and direction are inevitable whether it is in the administrative or educational or economic field.”

This is the other extreme. I do not like the extreme mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri S.S. More, and I do not also like this other extreme. I do not of course like a state or a condition in which the universities or educating institutions are bound hand and foot and have to look to Government at every step. This is a condition which I myself would not welcome.

Then there is another report in the same issue of the newspaper from which I quoted earlier, where the Education Minister of another important State has warned the university that if they do not take certain steps, they will have to take measures against that university. That is also not a very wholesome state of things.

Shri S.S. More: It is a politician's threat to an academic institution.

Shri M.D. Joshi: You are entitled to your opinion.

Then, I would mention the note of golden mean which has been struck by Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, which is a very welcome note. I crave your permission to read one or two lines from what he said:

“When we speak of university autonomy, let it be clearly understood that it is a type of freedom from unnecessary shackles and not a liberty which will degenerate into licence.”

That is the only attitude which universities should take.

Now, I am of opinion that a certain kind of control on the part of Government is necessary over our universities in the present state of things. Why? Because, when we are engaged in this gigantic task of rebuilding our nation, it is but proper that all our institutions, educational and others, should proceed along certain definite lines which are of a

national character. Our pandits and learned men who are managing the universities have been brought up in a particular atmosphere. They were educated in the previous generation. Many of the professors do not even like the prospect of an introduction of Hindi in the universities. I have come across several of my friends who are teachers and professors in universities and colleges, who are struggling against the prospect that after all they have to give up the English language and have to take up Hindi as the medium of instruction. This is only one thing which I have mentioned. There are several other things; take for example, basic education. Basic education is a thing which is very bitterly disliked not only by the learned pandits but even by certain primary teachers. Government have got to control this sort of tendency. If Government is not courageous enough to control this sort of reactionary tendency, then Government ceases to function. Therefore, I am definitely of the opinion that Government must step in to exercise effective control on educational institutions which are of a refractory nature.

I will mention one more thing. The Bombay Government have set a certain limit or standard of age by which a student should enter the university. The age limit is 16. The idea is that boys of very immature age should not enter universities for higher education. It is all a good idea no doubt, but all the other universities must take measures and devise rules so that one age should be obtainable in all the universities for entrance into the university. The Bombay Government goes in one direction; the Bombay Government is rightly considered to have advanced views. But there are also other Governments which hold advanced views but they are pulling in other directions. There must be somebody, some agency, which effects co-ordination in all these ideas and puts the universities on an equal footing. What happens is, for example, this: I shall take, for instance, the medium of instruction. There is a tussle going on at present in our country about the medium of instruction. Some people say that the medium of instruction should be the regional language. Some say it should be Hindi, and some cling to the hope that for several years English may be retained.

The number of such persons is dwindling. However, lovers of English there are in this country who cannot get reconciled to the idea that after all it is the regional language or the national language which has to be the medium of instruction.

About this medium of instruction there are different groups pulling in different directions in different Universities. It is high time

that our Central Government took strong steps to effect some kind of control in order that all these Universities may go in one direction and proceed in the same pace.

Therefore I submit that this Bill has not come a day too soon. This Bill devises certain clauses which contemplate control in the matter of co-ordination of studies, co-ordination of educational programmes and also maintenance of certain standards in the Universities.

I shall not discuss the clauses in detail. About the constitution of the Commission what I have to say is this. There are three sub-clauses, (a), (b) and (c) in clause 5(2). Sub-clause (a) says "not less than one-third of the number of members shall be chosen from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities and heads of institutions deemed to be Universities under section 3". Sub-clause (b) says "not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government". And sub-clause (c) says "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions or who have experience in administrative or financial matters". This part of the clause, that is, sub-clause 5(2-c) is, in my opinion, superfluous or unnecessary. Some might say it is objectionable. Because under clause 5(2) (b) not less than two members will be chosen from the Central Government. It will be the officers of the Central Government. In sub-clause (c) it is said that "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists of repute" — that is all right — "or who have obtained high academic distinctions" — that is also all right — "or who have experience in administrative or financial matters." That means they may be persons who may not have any kind of educational experience, who may not have any kind of educational qualification, who may have been merely administrators. Therefore, I think that this portion of the clause should be omitted so that the composition of the Commission will be unobjectionable.

Then about clause 9 I have to say that the Commission is empowered to take associate members for its deliberations. The associate members will not have the power to deliver their opinion. That is unobjectionable. But nowhere in this Bill is the State Government considered as a necessary factor. It is the State Government which is giving the grants. It is the State Government which has created several Universities; each State Government has got several Universities. And it is the State Government which is managing those Universities and Education, from top to bottom. But the State Government as such is given no

recognition whatsoever in this Bill. I think this is not very desirable. I think that each State Government should be associated, and therefore an obligatory clause should be put in by which it will be necessary for the Commission to have on its associate members' panel such members who will represent the State Government adequately.

I have to mention one subject of very great importance. I do not want to take longer time than is absolutely necessary for my purpose, and therefore leaving aside smaller points I shall concentrate on one major point. And that is the necessity of establishment of a Sanskrit University. We know that Sanskrit was taken notice of by the former foreign government. But today the importance of Sanskrit has heightened manifold, ten times or a hundred times. Because, Hindi is the chosen national language, and the vocabulary of Hindi is drawn, in the main, from Sanskrit. Sanskrit is the source, the repository which the vocabulary of Hindi will draw upon. But unfortunately as regards imparting instruction in Sanskrit our various Governments have not made adequate provision. I do not know of a single Sanskrit University or a Sanskrit college which is receiving adequate help. There are over two thousand Sanskrit *patha-shalas* and about eleven Sanskrit colleges. But there is not a single University which can co-ordinate the studies in all these institutions, which can prepare a scheme of education from beginning to end. Each *path-shala* or each college is going its own way, and there is no proper co-ordination or control over all these institutions. When India has come into its own and when India is boasting of her hoary past, is it not necessary that some kind of arrangement is made, some kind of measure is taken to preserve our very glorious ancient literature and to impart instruction in that literature to our younger generation who will be the future nation-builders? Therefore I very humbly submit to the attention of Government that a Sanskrit University may be created. Its seat may preferably be at Banaras or, if not, at Delhi or at any other centre which is known for its Sanskrit lore. That is the one suggestion which I have to press for the attention of Government.

As regards secondary education, my hon. friend Mr. N.M. Lingam dealt with it to some extent. Therefore, I shall not take longer time of the House in dealing with that question again. But while discussing this problem of secondary education with several of my friends who have experience of that branch, I found that there is serious discontent among teachers about the state of secondary education that obtains at least in my State. The discontent may be well-founded or may not be justified. I have nothing to do with that. But it is not a healthy state of

things that the Central Government should be sitting with equanimity at this spectacle of various Universities pulling in various directions and various Governments either checking the Universities or not checking the Universities at all. Therefore, the State Government should evolve a scheme, as suggested by the University Commission, in the primary, secondary and higher branches of education. That is the purpose for which the establishment of a University Grants Commission is absolutely necessary.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I welcome this Bill because I feel that an institution like the University Grants Commission can do a lot of good in this country. In this Bill, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is said that the University Grants Commission will co-ordinate the activities of the Universities, will determine the standards in the Universities, and also will see to the proper allocation of funds. There is enough scope for that kind of activity in this country. I think this Bill has come rather belatedly. As early as 1949, the University Commission recommended that such a Commission should be created. There is now greater need for such an institution, because, recently, in the last few years, many new Universities have come into existence. These Universities are struggling for funds. We have also to see that proper standards for higher education are maintained. There is another difficulty also. Since the attainment of independence, there is a demand that the Universities should impart education in the regional languages. When the Universities gradually take over to the regional languages, various difficulties will be created. At that time, Government will have to co-ordinate their activities and see that standards are maintained. There is also the work of co-ordination between the Universities regarding the distribution of specialities. There are a number of activities which could come under the purview of such an organisation. But we have to see that such an organisation, functions properly and that the composition is satisfactory.

As far as I can see, the University Grants Commission has been modelled on the University Grants Commission in the U.K. This organisation in England is working very well since 1919. It has played a very important role in co-ordinating the activities of the Universities, in developing the Universities and in giving proper funds to them. Unless this body functions properly, the whole object of creating such an institution will be frustrated. Let us, therefore, compare the composition and functions of the British University Grants Commission with the one that we are now envisaging. I shall first take up the composition of

the British University Grants Commission. The British Commission has no official or bureaucratic element in it. It is composed of eminent academicians who have influence and command respect in learned and University circles. I would like to quote a few lines from this Book, Government Assistance to Universities in Great Britain. About composition, it says:

“These are all University men themselves. They are naturally interested in having the Universities of Great Britain adequately and intelligently supported. Hence their desire to have as members of the advisory bodies persons who will command the confidence of the recipient universities and of whatever public is interested.”

Let us take the Chairman. There have been only two Chairmen. Both of them have been drawn from the University ranks. The first Chairman was:

“...Sir Walter Moberly, a lecturer in political science, professor of Philosophy and Vice-Chancellor of Manchester.”

After him came Dr. A.E. Trueman, F.R.S., a geologist at the universities of Wales, Bristol and Glasgow. What is the composition of the other members? This report says:

“It now includes a professor of German, a master of a Cambridge college, the principals of Ruskin and Somerville, a professor of the humanities from Aberdeen, the director of the Royal Botanical Gardens, a distinguished economist, and two prominent medical men. In the past a Nobel Prize winner and a president of the Advisory Council on Scientific policy each served for a number of years.”

Such are the people who compose the University Grants Commission in England. Then, as to their functions, this body functions informally and in a very friendly and delicate manner. In 1946, when the terms of reference were widened, it was in these terms:

“To enquire into the financial needs of University education in Great Britain; to advise the Government as to the application of any grants made by Parliament towards meeting them; to collect, examine and make available information on matters relating to university education at home and abroad; and to assist, in consultation with the Universities and other bodies concerned, the preparation and execution of such plans for the

development of the universities as may from time to time be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs."

In these terms of reference, there are no words which would give you an idea that this is a body which would supervise and control. There is no idea of control at all. It is one of help, assistance and advice.

How does it function? Like many other British institutions, it functions in a very delicate manner. They work; they do not show that they are working; they do not show that they are dominating. I shall again quote about the manner in which this institution has been functioning.

"The real way in which the University Grants Commission can get forward depends entirely upon a free, frank and informal standing contact, not bound by regulations or formalities."

Further, the report says:

"The University Grants Commission exercises great power although its hand is never shown publicly. It does not issue an annual report. It makes no public statements. It has no informal spokesman in the Press or elsewhere..."

"The University Grants Commission presents no materials for the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge other than a record of the number of students. Because of this, none of its financial tables gives a full picture of the university situation."

"It gives no breakdown by individual universities of earmarked grants. It does not tell in any detail the nature of the non-recurrent grants...etc."

In this very friendly way, the University Grants Commission in England functions. The report that it gives in regard to past operations and future needs is not given institution-wise, but field-wise. It is said in the report:

"....for there are no detailed data presented by the U.G.C. to make it possible to judge whether University 'A' is getting more or less than University 'B', or what the comparative costs of construction and equipment happen to be."

The result is this. The weaknesses of the different Universities are not exposed. There is no unhealthy rivalry for securing Government

grants between the different Universities. There is cordial relationship between the Grants Commission and the various Universities. Let us now see whether we are creating by this Bill such an institution and whether it will fulfil the same purpose as this institution. First of all, I shall take up the composition.

Clause 5 of the Bill says that there will be two Government representatives on the Board. In the British Commission, Government representatives are prominent by their absence. In the Bill there, no mention is made as to who should be the Chairman. But, here, we have already an existing University Grants Commission. The Chairman of this body was, first, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar and now, the present Secretary of the Education Ministry. We have nothing against these persons individually. But if the Secretary of the Ministry of Education becomes the Chairman of this Commission, I am afraid, the bureaucratic influence on the Commission will be very great. The Commission will not be able to function as an independent body, as it should if it is really to work for helping the universities and in developing higher education. As it is, in India, the danger exists of too much interference by the Government in the University affairs. I will not go into details because of shortage of time. I shall just give one extract from the Report of the University Education Commission. This is the evidence given by Shri P.M. Lad, who is now the Secretary of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, before the Commission. This evidence is about the Bombay University, which is supposed to be one of our most advanced Universities. This is what he says:

“Every proposal for affiliation of a college must go to the Government. I would suggest that the Government should not have the power to waive some of the conditions laid down by the University. Governments may have power to order an enquiry in extreme cases, but Government should not impose its will on the University.

Please mark his words:

“Government should not impose its will on the University.”

There is a genuine fear that there is already too much interference by the Government in the Universities affairs, and that this body may further help in this tendency. Besides, we know that since the attainment of Independence, some politicians are unduly interfering in the Universities affairs. I do not wish to quote many examples, but I shall only quote the example of a neighbouring university – the Lucknow University. It is a

notorious fact that one important politician of the province dominates the university. If such a thing happens, it is very natural that the university cannot progress in the proper way.

The University Education Commission is very alive to this danger and that has been expressed in page 450 of its report which has been already quoted by Mr. More. So, I will not take up the time of the House by quoting it again.

In this connection, the University Grants Commission of England has something to say. It is very essential for the proper development of higher education that there should not be any undue interference, and the autonomy of the university must not be interfered with in any way.

The University Grants Commission, England, after reviewing the development of Universities between 1937 and 1947 states in the Report:

“The relationship between the State and the Universities may be conceived as a form of partnership. On the side of the Universities there is every evidence of a progressive spirit and of a genuine desire to accommodate their policies to the various demands of public interests. On the side of the Government, there is recognition of the overriding duty of those who follow the academic path to ascertain truth and to proclaim it without respect to the convenience of the Government.”

I emphasize the last sentence, viz. “that the overriding duty of those who follow the academic path is to ascertain the truth and to proclaim it without respect to the convenience of the Government”. If this high ideal has to be maintained, we must be very careful when we establish such an institution.

Then, I come to the matter of the operation of funds, because one of the most important functions of such a body would be proper allocation of funds. How does the British Committee function in this matter? Their object being to help the University to plan and build and not to use the instrument of financial control for undue interference or exercise of control, they give grants in three ways. Firstly, they make block grants. While making block grants, the universities make an estimate of their normal requirements over a period of five years. The sums, after consultation and agreement, are sanctioned. It helps Universities to plan out with ease. Once a grant is made, the internal disposal is a matter for the University. When such a grant is given for five years, the University can plan in its own way. Every year they will

have to take a few other steps and enough funds for that will be forthcoming.

The second is earmarked grants. These are annual grants for specific purposes. Here, of course, the Universities place before the Commission whatever they require, and after consultation and agreement, the amount is granted. Once the amount is sanctioned, they cannot interfere in that matter.

Then also, there are non-recurring grants, annual grants mainly for capital and other outlay.

So, in this way the grants are made. They do not interfere with the affairs of the university or its internal working.

Secondly, very large funds are placed at the disposal of the Grants Commission, because, unless they can give adequate assistance, there is no meaning in creating such an important body.

The Bill in the Financial Memorandum says that the total amount for this year would be Rs. 1.81 crores. This is a very inadequate amount. If this is an indication of the future picture, then I should say that we have unnecessarily created this huge organisation for a very small purpose.

Shri S.S. More: We are purchasing control at that price.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: It is now recognised that for higher study and research, adequate public funds must be available. This is also recognised in India because in the Report of the University Education Commission this matter has been very thoroughly discussed. The Report of the University Education Commission says that in India the Government should meet 60 per cent. expenditure, 30 per cent. should come from fees and 10 per cent. from endowments. The total of this would be Rs. 8.69 crores from Central and Provincial Governments and Rs. 4.20 crores recurring for five years in the shape of annual grants. They say that if such an amount is made available, only then adequate tuition, library, scholarship and freeships, laboratories and hostel accommodation can be made available for the students. Then, they go further. They say that we need more professional educational institutions, that these institutions should be doubled in the next ten years, and further that the Government should meet 60 per cent. of the recurring expenditure, and 75 per cent. of the capital expenditure. Further, even for affiliated institutions which now get very little help from the Government, they say that if these institutions are to have a proper academic atmosphere and to function properly, the Government should give

grants to cover half the salaries of the sanctioned posts. All this requires a huge amount. If all that amount is made available, then only this Grants Commission can function properly in the matter of allocating funds to the Universities in order to help the Universities to develop on the right lines.

Now, I would like to compare the conditions obtaining in Britain. I am trying to hurry as much as possible because of shortage of time, but some figures have to be quoted. Now, university income sources in Great Britain are these. I shall give you two years: 1935-36 and 1949-50. Through endowments in 1935-36, the Universities secured 14.5 per cent., and in 1949-50, 5.7 per cent. Through donations and subscriptions, in 1935-36 they secured 2.5 per cent. and in 1949-50, 1.7 per cent. Through grants from local educational authorities, they secured 8.7 per cent. and 4.6 per cent. respectively. And this is the most important thing. Through Parliamentary grants, in 1935-36 they got 34 per cent. and in the latter year they got 63.9 per cent. — practically 64 per cent. in the earlier year and 17 per cent. in the latter year. So, now 64 per cent. of the needs of the Universities are met from Government funds in England.

Then, in the matter of scholarships and freeships, the Commission in the United Kingdom assists a large number of students through freeships and scholarships. In 1949-50, 62,000 students out of 85,000 students, *i.e.*, 73 per cent. of the students got freeships and scholarships. In India, our University Education Commission report says that the present position is that about 10 per cent. of the total enrolment is entitled to exemption from payment of tuition fees. What does it amount to? Exemption from payment of tuition fees amounts to $\frac{1}{6}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the total expenditure of the students. Then, as far as Government university scholarships are concerned, they do not generally exceed one per cent. That is the dismal picture of educational condition in India.

This report recommends that 12,500 scholarships of an average of Rs. 600 per year should be granted and 37,500 freeships of Rs. 250 per year should be granted. This alone would bring us to an expenditure of Rs. 1.68 crores a year. The University Education Commission recommended that Rs. 1.6 crores should be granted merely for freeships and scholarships, and the total amount provided here is Rs. 1.81 crores for the entire functioning of the Commission. That shows we are not really serious about it. We really do not want this big institution that we are creating to function in a proper way as it has functioned in England. If we give these scholarships 15 per cent. of the total enrolment will get free places and 5 per cent. will get some scholarship.

I will give you a few more figures. The total that we are spending on education in India is 5 per cent. In the United Kingdom it is 11 per cent. and in France 12 per cent. So, if we are really serious about the creation of the University Grants Commission and allowing it to function properly, much more funds than what has been made available should be made available to it.

Then, there is a small matter to which I would like to refer because we are discussing this in Delhi. In giving fund, the University Grants Commission must be very careful to see that it does not create new difficulties for the universities. Recently, in the Delhi University, the University Grants Commission gave some money and asked them to raise the pay of the university staff. The Delhi University has federative character and it was the rule here that all the staff, whether of the constituent colleges or the University college, should get the same pay. By creating this invidious distinction, much confusion has been created in the ranks of the college staff. So, instead of this body helping the University, easing the difficulties of the University, it has created a new difficulty for the University. So, not only has the Government to be very careful to see that the composition of the Commission is proper, that it functions properly, but the Commission itself must be careful to see that it does not create new difficulties in the realm of education.

In conclusion, I would like to say that either we should not pass this Bill and should not create this institution – for as Shri S.S. More has said, there are already other bodies which are doing almost similar work – or if we create this institution, then we should see that it plays the rightful role that it should play and which a similar institution is playing today in England. I would urge the Members of the Select Committee to see that the composition of this Commission is not such that the bureaucratic element gets an opportunity to dominate over the institution, and through their domination, through their financial control, take away the autonomy of the Universities. It is the responsibility of all of us, of each one of us who have had the good fortune of receiving University education to see that the autonomy of the University is zealously safeguarded. I hope the Members of the Select Committee will see to it, because I feel that the intellectual life of no country can develop under the shadow of a domineering bureaucracy. Today, India is suffering from an over-dominant bureaucracy. Let this bureaucracy not spread its tentacles into the realm of University education.

Mr. Chairman: Next, I call upon Shri Barrow. As there is quite a good number of speakers, I would request the hon. Member to be very brief.

Shri Barrow (Nominated – Anglo-Indians): I shall be as brief as possible. I start by welcoming the idea and the principle of establishing as a statutory body, the University Grants Commission. I am grateful to my hon. friend Shri S.S. More for focusing attention on the fact that this device for co-ordinating and – I would not like to use the word ‘controlling’ – maintaining standards in our universities is patterned on the British model. I also thank him for drawing the attention of the Select Committee to the fact that when the resolution of the 6th Qinquennial Conference of the Inter-University Board was considered by the University Education Commission, the Commission took particular note of the latter part of the resolution, namely:

“the emphatic opinion that the autonomy and independence of the universities receiving such grants should not be interfered with.”

I want to focus attention on the atmosphere, the circumstances and the context in which the British University Grants Committee was created and established, and the atmosphere in which the Grants Commission here is being established.

I refer to this advisedly because it will be fundamental in determining the scope and extent of the powers delegated to the Commission, as I believe that we must not interfere with the autonomy of our Universities, nor must we interfere with their academic freedom. By academic freedom, I mean the right to teach what one believes to be true.

The hon. Member from Ratnagiri, who is not present now, used the word ‘control’. If all our universities are going to be controlled by the State, then I believe that the State will be guilty of the greatest tyranny, the tyranny of the mind. I believe also, that if we are to follow the advice – which was read out by my hon. friend from Ratnagiri – of the Chief Minister of Mysore, then we will be introducing into our universities, into our University scheme, a kind of bed of Procrustes; we will lop off and stretch and bring about a dead uniformity. We must not control them. The hon. lady Member Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has spoken of the subtle way in which the British University Grants Commission functions, and that is the ideal we should aim at.

I believe, that when the Grants Commission in Great Britain was inaugurated or established in 1919, it was done with a view to, “encouraging and facilitating limited improvements as the Universities could see their way to undertake”. There was no question of any control; it was only a limited function to encourage and to facilitate, and it was done

in an atmosphere of reverence for British Universities as centres of learning, of respect for them as centres of free enquiry and freedom, and as centres of advanced research. It was in this atmosphere of respect and awe that this Grants Commission in the United Kingdom was established.

But what do we find in India? Every petty person, speaking on every petty occasion criticises our university system, criticises our system of education – whether they are fitted to do so or not is another matter. On any occasion, whether it is a prize-giving at a primary institution, or the Convocation of a University, some one will criticise our system of education, as if to say our Great Men of Learning, who are controlling the Universities, do not realise the shortcomings. It is in this atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that we are establishing a University Grants Commission. We must allay distrust, we must allay suspicion that we are trying to gain control of the Universities. We must encourage and facilitate; but we must not try to direct or control. I would ask the Select Committee to remember that in bringing the Bill in its final form to this House, they must be careful to avoid any suggestion whatsoever that the Central Government is trying to control and direct the Universities.

How can we achieve this purpose? I would refer here to an article written on “State Aid to Britain’s Universities”, by the Editor of the *Times Education Supplement*. He says:

“The strongest evidence that the autonomy of universities is a reality and not merely a pious fiction is afforded by the facts that the Treasury Grants to them” – I emphasise this in particular – “is not subject to any form of government audit, and that they have the absolute right to select the students they will receive and to give them the courses they believe most appropriate.”

I want to emphasise again the fact that when the grants are given, there is no question of a government audit. Those of us who are acquainted with Government audit know what a deadening influence it can be on any freedom or expansion.

I would ask the Select Committee to consider carefully sub-clause (i) of clause 26, where provision is made for framing rules:

“any other matter which has to be, or may be, prescribed.”

I say that the Select Committee must make explicit and specific provision under this clause excluding any form of Government audit;

otherwise, I believe the autonomy of our universities will be threatened and endangered.

I have referred to the atmosphere in which the British Grants Commission was created, and that in which the Indian Grants Commission is being created. I want also to refer to the context in which the Grants Committee is working in Britain and in which our Commission is going to work.

In Great Britain the Grants Committee is the dominant financial body. It provides, according to the 1951-52 figures, 66.5 per cent. of the income and the Local Education Authority provides 4.1 per cent. In India – Shri S.S. More has already given us the figures, and I do not want to go into them – the States are going to be, according to the University Education Commission's Report, the 'principal paymasters of all the Universities but three'. Now, we are going to introduce another financial factor, that is, grants from the Centre. In this tug of war, between the centre and the States, with the noose round the independence and autonomy of the universities, it is easy to visualise what will happen.

When the Select Committee is considering this Bill, they have to be very careful to specify the scope of this Grants Commission. I believe that that is absolutely essential, if the States on the one side and the Centre on the other are not going to toss the universities about.

The Radhakrishnan Commission suggested that the University Grants Commission should be responsible for post-graduate and research work, and that it should bear 50 per cent. of the cost, and should have – I would not like to say a major controlling influence – a major influence in post-graduate and research work.

I am going to differ, and do so with great humility from what has been suggested by the Radhakrishnan Commission. I suggest that the scope of the University Grants Commission should be limited to the first degree course. I say this advisedly because education at the school stage is a State subject. If there is to be any uniformity of standards in the secondary stage, it can be attained, I believe, by the first degree course helping to maintain those standards. I believe also that if there is a certain uniformity of standards in the first degree course, then the research work must necessarily be of a higher standard.

I believe again, that eventually, in the India to come, every boy or girl entering the University should know, and must know, three languages – the mother tongue or the regional language, Hindi and English. If this Grants Commission is able to influence the first degree course, then it

will be able to help and develop these three languages which will be absolutely essential for every student. I suggest emphatically that the scope of this Commission should be limited strictly to the first degree course.

I believe, also that it will give the Commission some experience – the Commission is going into this thing absolutely new – so that it can work out a pattern of partnership, which will give confidence to the Universities, and confidence to the States, that the Commission is going to work in co-operation with them. I end with these words: the problem of the Select Committee will be to reconcile two principles: the principle of planning – Central and State planning – and the principle of University autonomy.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): I believe that all sections in this House are agreed that there ought to be a University Grants Commission for allocating funds to different Universities on objective grounds. The questions that face us are: what should be the composition of the University Grants Commission, what is the degree of interference that the executive can be allowed in the constitution and the working of such a Commission. At the outset, let me refer to certain elementary details which have probably escaped the attention of my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary, who is piloting this Bill. He has referred to 'co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions' being the main objective and the purpose of the proposed University Grants Commission. Parliament, according to the Constitution, has been clothed with exclusive authority to co-ordinate and determine standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. The purpose of the Constitution-makers, I take it, is that Parliament should lay down general principles to be followed in constituting a Commission for achieving the objectives laid down in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Such a Commission has necessarily to be autonomous in character. The nature of education, the cultural diversity of educational effort, the difficult problems that meet us in the higher reaches of education and the manner in which standards ought to be determined cannot, and should not, obviously be decided by the executive; these must be determined by an objective and independent body which should not be the handmaid of the executive. That, I take it, is the guiding purpose and the objective of this Bill. But, the manner in which we have departed from this objective is a matter for profound regret, which, I hope, the Joint Committee will take note, and rectify in time.

The point, however, which has to be borne in mind and which, I believe is emphasised by all sections of this House is that the University Grants Commission must be a properly constituted Commission. Without its being a properly constituted Commission, it will not command the confidence, not only of Universities but also of educationists and all citizens who are interested in the cultural development of our country. Education cannot be regimented; educational development has to be considered carefully and has to be co-ordinated after taking account of the various aspects which go to determine the criteria of a full and purposeful culture. Especially as we intend giving vast powers to the University Grants Commission – and I refer hon. Members to clause 3 since that clause gives us a clear idea of what the University Grants Commission is intended to be – it is all the more necessary that the University Grants Commission should be a properly constituted body. Clause (3) reads as follows:

“The Central Government may, on the advice of the Commission, declare, by notification in the Official Gazette, that any institution for higher education, other than a University, shall be deemed to be a University for the purpose of this Act, and on such a declaration being made, all the provisions of this Act shall apply to such institution as if it were a University within the meaning of clause (f) of section 2.”

I suggest that in order that the advice might be proper, in order that the advice might also be of such a type as to give a proper guidance to the Government for determining and allocating funds available to the various institutions and for bringing them up to a proper standard, the Commission should be so constituted as to be autonomous and independent of the executive. My learned friend, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, pointed out that the University Grants Commission in the United Kingdom was a purely advisory body and....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): She is not so learned as he suggests.

Dr. Krishnaswami: At least, she is more learned than my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, who always intervenes. But I should like to point out that in the United Kingdom the University Grants Commission is an advisory body. We are not to have an advisory body; we are to have a statutory body. Let us therefore have a purely statutory body instead of having a hybrid monster as in the Bill that has been introduced. What should be the constitution of the University Grants Commission? I do

not have the time to go at length into the various aspects of the constitution of this body, but I should like to point out that one of the principles that would have to be accepted by this House is that the constitution of the body should be, as far as possible, elective. If members are elected, they would be beholden to the Universities; but if they are nominated, they would be beholden to the nominating authority. That is the basic principle; that is the reason for my suggesting that, as far as possible, the University Grants Commission should be predominantly an elected body. But I agree that there are practical difficulties which should be taken into account and that occasionally we have to make reluctant concessions to the principle of nomination. I am willing to concede that if this body is constituted on the basis of election, some of the backward Universities might not be represented. Nomination, at any rate, gives the Government the power to provide for better regional representation of some of the Universities which might not find a place in the University Grants Commission. If this be the dominant consideration, and this is a rational justification for adopting the principle of nomination Government should be content with exercising the right of nomination instead of taking upon themselves a residuary power, the formidable power to eject, to throw out those Vice-Chancellors who might be considered obstreperous by them but who possibly are independent and are a source of inconvenience to the executive as all men with a conscience are. I have not been able to understand how any Government which takes the idea of university education seriously could ever give support to a proposal that 'every member shall, unless his appointment is terminated earlier by the Central Government, hold office for a period of six years'. The roots of independence of a University Grants Commission are cut by this provision in this Bill. Why should the executive have the power, once it has exercised the right of nomination, to exercise at any moment the power of ejection of an inconvenient member from the Commission? Rather than allow the executive to exercise this power, I suggest to the House and the Joint Committee that the tenure of membership be reduced from six to three years so that the need for exercising this power may not arise at all. Remember, after all, that if the University Grants Commission is to be taken seriously, it must command the confidence of educationists. But if it is felt that at some state or the other somebody from the Ministry of Education has the power to remove any inconvenient member, then it would be next to impossible to build that feeling of corporate respect, which we all have at heart and

which the Minister desires to promote. This is an obnoxious provision which should not find a place in this Bill; and which I do hope the members of the Joint Committee would remove. It touches the vital question of the self-respect of those members who are to be nominated to that body. Even if we reluctantly accept the principle of nomination, as I have suggested, there can be no possibility of our accepting the other principle, namely, that of members being ejected if they do not happen to agree with the powers that be in the executive. I do not go into the question of the propriety of nominating officials of the Government of India on this body. But the very fact that Government will have two members on this body underlines the need for this provision being omitted altogether. The sword of Damocles held over the heads of the various members of the University Grants Commission is not fair and will not conduce to the production of those objective reports on the conditions of the University, to the evolving of those criteria which are important for determining standards, and which would help us to find out what the standards of University education are. Since Parliament has been given the fullest power in the Union List to determine the standards, we cannot choose to abrogate our powers to the executive. The executive is after all different from Parliament; it is Parliament that has the primary responsibility.

I have looked into the other provisions of this Bill and two provisions of this Bill have struck me as rather odd. I refer to clause 12. It deals with the functions of the Commission and I hope I am not taking the time of the House in quoting one or two sub-clauses of this clause for the purpose of elucidating the point that I have in mind. Clause 12 reads as follows:

“It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take all such steps as it may think fit for the co-ordination and determination of standards of teaching and examination in Universities, and for the purpose of effectively discharging its functions under this Act, the Commission may –

- (a) inquire into the financial needs of Universities;
- (b) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose:

Provided that in making any such grant to a University, the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the University concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purpose which it may be called upon to serve;”

What are the national purposes that the framers of this Bill have in view? I should have thought that Universities are constituted under a Charter or under an enactment of the Legislature and once they have been so constituted under an enactment of the Legislature, the purposes which they are expected to fulfil are absolutely national. It is therefore unconstitutional, apart from its being improper on the part of an outside authority, to tell the Universities that there are national purposes other than those in enactments for them to fulfil. Such directives militate against the autonomy of States which are responsible for the creation of University. Besides, who is to determine these national purposes? It has been left delightfully vague as to what national purposes they may be called upon to fulfil. In other words, it means that somebody from the executive, somebody from the Education Department would have the right to issue directions and tell the Universities that if these directives are not fulfilled because they are supposedly in the national interest, the University Grants Commission would withhold grants to Universities. Can anything more perverse be thought of? If this provision finds a place in the enactment, Universities may not stand to gain by having a University Grants Commission which is expected to apply the thumb-screws of torture. Is this going to be the function of the proposed University Grants Commission? Unfortunately, the powers that have been given to the University Grants Commission and the powers that have been reserved to the executive in this Bill give us the impression that what is envisaged by the framers of this Bill is that Universities are to be a poor image or an enlarged reflection of the bureaucratic mechanism in the Government of India. It may be that I am uncouth in my estimate of the propensities of those in charge of the Education Department. They may, on the other hand, be well-intentioned men. But if such powers are given, they are liable to be abused. Today they may not be abused, but, tomorrow some other officer or some other Minister in charge of Education may think it his sacred duty to issue a directive to the Universities and tell them that if they do not fulfil it, which he or the executive envisages, then they will be subject to penalties. And, in this connection, clause 14 acquires significance. Clause 14 refers to the penalties to be imposed on the Universities that do not carry out these directives. Grants may be withheld and Universities might be put, as it were, on a black-list. The whole spirit and tenor of this Bill is opposed to the constitution, proper functioning and autonomy of Universities in our country. If I have spoken strongly it is because I feel that a great blow is sought to be

influenced on our Universities, many of which have contributed not a little to the welfare and education of our people. I hope and trust that at least now wisdom will dawn on those who have sponsored this Bill, that our friends in the Joint Select Committee will put forth these points of view strongly and resolutely and carry conviction to those who have framed this Bill. Universities have a greater and a more vital part to play in our country and, to the best of our powers, it should be our aim and objective to encourage plurality of autonomous institutions, to encourage institutions which are corporate in character and to see that these Universities which are corporate in character and to see that these Universities which are primarily responsible for raising the standards of education in our country are strengthened. If the University Grants Commission fulfils these objects, I venture to think that Maulana Azad, who occupies a great place in our political history, will go down as a great Minister of Education capable of rising superior to the environment – the bureaucratic environment in which he and all of us seem to be placed.

Mr. Chairman: Babu Ramnarayan Singh. There are only 15 or 20 minutes and there are two speakers left. So, I would request the hon. Member to be short.

Speech delivered by Babu Ram Narayan Singh¹ in Devanagiri (Hindi)²

Shri N.B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): While supporting the establishment of the University Grants Commission, we have to point out that there are certain provisions in the Bill which require to be changed radically, and these changes refer to the very definition of “university” as provided in the Bill, the composition of the Commission as well as the functions of the Commission. With regard to the definition, we have to point out that it is very narrow and it does not include within its ambit the affiliated colleges that form the vast majority of the colleges which provide for university education in our country. I shall give some details to show how it will affect such affiliated colleges. Taking certain universities, – in Andhra University, there are four constituent colleges and 31 affiliated colleges; in Bombay University, there are three teaching departments and 22 affiliated colleges; in Calcutta University, there are 38 constituent colleges and teaching departments and 104 affiliated colleges; in Madras University, there are 20 constituent

1. --Member of Lok Sabha from Hazari Bagh West (Bihar).

2. Not included.

colleges, 21 teaching departments and 58 affiliated colleges; in the Punjab University, there are 14 teaching departments, three constituent colleges and 57 affiliated colleges; in Travancore-Cochin University, there are nine constituent colleges, only one teaching department and 13 affiliated colleges. In whole country, are told that there are 137 constituent colleges and 538 affiliated colleges. If we exclude these affiliated colleges, then we are in doubt as to how far the Grants Commission will take into account the needs of such colleges. In regard to enrolment we find that out of about 3,96,000 students, about 3,03,000 students read in the affiliated colleges. If we come to the expenditure, that is, the cost of university education, say in the Calcutta University, out of an expenditure of about Rs. 1,81,00,000 in the university departments only Rs. 16,81,348 was spent, and for the affiliated colleges Rs. 1,64,77,314 was spent. So, from this it will be clear that, unless we take within this definition the affiliated colleges the vast majority of the colleges will be left untouched and the Radhakrishnan Commission has made specific recommendations with regard to this point.

Then there is another important point and it is about the provision which they have to make about the living conditions of teachers. We find in *Education in Universities in India*, a statistical survey published by the Ministry of Education, that:

“....from the pay scales of different categories of university teachers during 1950-51, as many as 13 universities had not found it possible to start their Lecturers on Rs. 300, as recommended by the University Education Commission;

The distribution of teachers, according to their monthly salaries, was as follows:

Between Rs. 100 and 150	..	6,034
Between Rs. 151 and 250	..	7,369
Between Rs. 251 and 450	..	5,177
Between Rs. 451 and 650	..	1,329
Between Rs. 651 and 850	..	525”

and so on. This shows on an average that (a) nearly 90 per cent. of the teachers received less than Rs. 450 per month and (b) two out of every three teachers were paid salaries between Rs. 100 and Rs. 250. But it is said later on:

“The university teacher should be helped to live in comfort, if he is to devote himself to learning, teaching and research... I

hope the university services will become as attractive as All-India Services, for that is the only way to recruit and retain some of the ablest persons for the universities."

This is what Dr. Radhakrishnan has said and has been quoted in that book. But in spite of all those recommendations for the development of university education, nothing has been done so far. We are hearing about the new deal for labour, new deal for peasants, new deal for teachers also, and it has been said so in this survey from which I quoted, but nothing so far has been done. So, if we have to develop university education, we have to take special care of this aspect of the problem.

It has already been pointed out by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani that with regard to Delhi University there are certain anomalies. After the establishment of the University Grants Commission, when some of the employees, clerks, peons, etc., and also librarians and similar employees of that university, represented their case to the University Grants Commission, the Commission wrote that this is an internal matter for the University and they have nothing to do with it. When the employees wrote to the university, they said that after the establishment of the University Grants Commission, they cannot decide this matter. When they wrote to the Ministry, they also evaded their responsibilities and said they had nothing to do. But, while they wanted to bring about a change in the salaries payable to the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar, they did it quite quickly. We are told that the Vice-Chancellor's salary was raised from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 2,500, and that of the Registrar, from Rs. 500-750 to Rs. 500-900, giving sometimes three special increments, etc. Such things could be done. While in Delhi, school teachers in recognised schools are getting such allowances as city allowance, house-rent allowance, etc., the Delhi University teachers are not at all getting this. This is the result of the establishment of the University Grants Commission. This is a thing which we must take serious note of.

Now, regarding the composition of the Commission. We want a really autonomous, independent Grants Commission, whose activities would not be interfered with by the Government. But we find from section 20 of the Bill that the Commission is going to be made the handmaid of the Government itself. It has been stated in the Bill thus:

"In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy as may be given to it by the Central Government.

If any dispute arises between the Central Government and the Commission as to whether a question is or is not a question

of policy, the decision of the Central Government shall be final."

So, from this, it is clear, as has been very severely criticised by some other hon. Members, that they are going to utilise the Grants Commission as a sort of big stick on the universities. This should not be so. Our universities, which have played a vital and important role in the development of higher education in this country should not be allowed to be hindered in this manner. The autonomous character of the universities, particularly with reference to their internal administration, the determination of standard, etc., should be preserved and there should be sufficient scope for the universities to decide their policies themselves.

Then, I shall come to another aspect of the problem which has been referred to in the Bill itself. We find that according to the Constitution, power has been vested in Parliament to decide the type of higher education, university education, etc., and according to that provision, this University Grants Commission is going to be established. Although in clause 19 it has been stated that the annual accounts of the Commission along with the audit report thereon would be placed before Parliament, there is no provision in clause 18 that Parliament would also receive the reports about the activities of the Commission, about the standards and other particulars with regard to the universities for which the Commission may make any grants. So we feel that they should submit not only the report on accounts etc., but the reports with regard to the standards, the determination of standards and such other particulars should be submitted to Parliament. If we do not do that, I doubt whether it would be quite proper for this House to give its consent to such a measure.

Mr. Chairman: I hope the hon. Member will conclude by two of the clock.

Shri N.B. Chowdhury: I conclude, and resume my seat.

Mr. Chairman: I did not mean that the Member should sit down immediately. He can have another two minutes if he wants.

Shri N.B. Chowdhury: Then, I want to point out one other matter, with regard to the determination of standards. Nowadays, we find that there is no consistency or conformity between the standard of the secondary education and the university education, and sometimes this inconsistency leads to difficulties for many students. I have seen in my state of West Bengal that such anomalies persist not only between primary education and secondary education but also between the

standards of secondary education and higher education. Although here we are dealing with university education only, since we have the power under this Bill to advise the universities with regard to the determination of the standards and have right to call for returns, information, etc., we should make it a point to see that consistency with regard to standards is maintained so far as the different levels of education are concerned.

Dr. M.M. Das: I have listened with great interest and attention to the discussion that followed my motion, and I am highly thankful to the hon. Members who have taken part in this debate for the support they have given to this Bill and to the motion for referring this Bill to the Select Committee. Regarding the provisions of this Bill, some dissentient voices were heard. Some hon. Members did not see eye to eye with the Government and they differed in their opinions from the Government about particular provisions of this Bill. Difference of opinion is the life of democracy and democratic legislatures. In a democratic Parliament like this difference of opinion is inevitable. Therefore, I am not at all sorry, on the contrary I am glad and I am highly thankful to the Members for the different viewpoints they have placed and for the criticisms they have made. The motion before the House seeks to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. Government is fully aware of the fact that there are different views, there are different opinions regarding the provisions of this Bill. Government is fully conscious of the fact that there may be even some real ground for criticisms. The intention of the Government in referring this Bill to a Select Committee is to discuss thoroughly, to examine minutely all these different views expressed by hon. Members and all the provisions that are contained in this Bill and then in the Select Committee to square them out and secure the greatest amount of agreement that is possible.

With the exception of a few extravagant remarks which betray gross lack of correct information on the part of a few hon. Members, the discussions on the whole have been very informative, helpful and constructive. In this connection I wish to convey my thanks to the hon. lady Member opposite, from Bengal – she is not here in the House at the moment. I am thankful to her, for at least on this occasion she tried to be as much considerate and constructive as was possible for her. I am referring to Shrimati Renu Chakravarty..

Mr. Chairman: Because the Mover was.

Dr. M.M. Das: My hon. friend Shri Gurupadaswamy who initiated this discussion, and many other friends, raised a very important issue, the question of autonomy of our Universities. This has been practically

the main theme of the discussion and many of the hon. Members have spoken upon this particular question. My hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy said that the Bill did not explain the relation between the Central Government and the University, that it did not explain what it meant by 'standards' and he was afraid that our Universities will lose their autonomy and there will be dual control. The other Members who spoke upon this question practically took the same line: they were afraid that the Central Government, by enacting this measure, will take away the autonomy of the Universities. That was the main complaint made. This is perhaps the most important question that has been raised during the course of the discussion and I wish to deal with it in some detail.

This House is aware that the Government — not only the Central Government but the State Governments also — have accepted the University Education Commission's recommendations as their guide to formulate the future pattern of our Universities. So this House is aware that the existing University Grants Commission, which has already been established about a year back by a resolution of the Government and which is now carrying on its work, — the existing University Grants Commission was created and the present Bill has been drafted, in pursuance of the recommendations of the University Education Commission. I am glad that hon. Members have quoted profusely from that great, authoritative and comprehensive document. But I beg to submit to you and to this House that this great comprehensive document has been misquoted to the greatest extent possible by hon. Members.

I request my hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy to refer to that great document, the University Education Commission's report, and he will find there the answers to his question. One full Chapter, Chapter IV, containing about thirty-four pages has been devoted to explaining what is meant by 'standards', the different aspects of this question, the standard of teaching and the standard of examination in our Universities.

Regarding the autonomy the constitution of our Universities and control, and the so-called dual control, over our Universities, I beg to refer to Chapter XIII of this report; and for the benefit of the hon. Members who have quoted from this report and for the benefit of the House I wish to place before the House a few relevant lines. In the Introduction to this great report of the University Education Commission of which Dr. Radhakrishnan was the Chairman, it is said:

"The marked deterioration of standards in teaching and examinations and increasing dissatisfaction with the conduct of

university administration and elections to university authorities are matters of great concern. The universities as the makers of the future cannot persist in the old patterns, however, valid they may have been in their own day. With the increasing complexity of society and its shifting pattern, universities have to change their objectives and methods, if they are to function effectively in our national life. A policy of drift in the vague hope that if the universities are granted full autonomy and are permitted to pursue their own ends with intelligence and imagination, higher education will take care of itself, will be dangerous. Automatic and spontaneous adjustment will not take us to the future we want. We must develop a comprehensive positive policy within the limits of which there should be ample scope for pioneering and experimentation."

Then again, on page 404 of the Report the Commission says:

"In some subjects there is felt to be the need, without impairing local initiative, for a co-ordinating power to be retained by the Centre –

- (a) to ensure that all Provinces, States and Unions act within certain limits or observe certain minimum standards,
- (b) to ensure that, where different units which to develop different special activities, a coherent over-all national policy emerges, without glaring examples of unnecessary duplication on the one hand or unfilled gaps on the other, and
- (c) to enable joint planning by Provinces, States and Unions where this is necessary."

My hon. friend Dr. Krishnaswami – I do not find him in his place – waxed eloquent and asked what does this Bill mean by national purpose. The national purpose has been explained in a masterly way in these three reasons, (a) (b) and (c) which I have just quoted. These are the national purposes meant by this Bill.

Then the Report says:

"With the central guidance of policy that the University Grants Commission can give them, we are confident that they (that is the Universities) will prove a unifying force in the nation. But unfortunately there is clear evidence that in some universities local control has already led to actions tending to disunion."

“There are Universities in India today...”

I want to draw your particular attention to this line—

“...whose administration is unsatisfactory. Even in purely academic matters such as the appointment of examiners and awarding of degree, their procedures and standards are suspect...”

I want to draw particular attention to the word ‘suspect’.

Shri S.S. More: What is the quality of Government administration? It is also suspect.

Dr. M.M. Das: To you; not to the majority of the people.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: To the whole country.

Dr. M.M. Das: “The existence of such a state of things is immeasurably damaging to our national prestige. It is clear that under existing conditions, it has not been possible to effect much improvement.”

I beg to submit to you that the University Education Commission recommended the inclusion of Universities in the Concurrent List of our Constitution: that is both under the Central Government as well as the State Governments, because nearly all the witnesses – they were all eminent men and organisations – expressed their opinion in favour of the inclusion of Universities in the Concurrent List. This is what the Commission says on this subject:

“Nearly all our witnesses have expressed their opinion as to the proper category for university education, Central, Concurrent or Provincial. A minority, but a minority including some important witnesses, think it should be Central. A very large majority, both of university spokesmen and of public men and women think it should be Concurrent. Practically the only witnesses who thought it should be provincial were the representatives of the Provincial Governments in one or two Provinces. The significant thing was that even among the representatives of Provincial Governments a substantial majority preferred Concurrence.”

Again, the Commission says:

“We may say at once that we agree with the majority in thinking that the All-India aspects of university education, the repercussions and interchanges necessary and desirable between universities and the need for a national guarantee of minimum standards of efficiency make it impossible for university education to remain a purely provincial subject.”

Although the University Education Commission wanted the Universities to be a Concurrent subject, the makers of our Constitution preferred to keep them a State subject, to item 66 of the Union List, that is, only the responsibility of maintenance of co-ordination and maintenance of standards were given in the hands of the Central Government. So far as the present measure is concerned, Government have not gone, nor are they permitted to go by our Constitution, beyond the limits of item 66 of the Union List. Under this Bill the Government seek to secure only that much of power which will enable them to discharge the responsibilities that have been placed upon them by our Constitution, namely, the responsibility under item 66 of the Union List. Government want to take into their hands powers only to discharge two responsibilities. They want to ensure that the money that would be given to the Universities from the Central Exchequer should be properly spent, and secondly, they want that they should be able to discharge the constitutional responsibility namely, maintenance of co-ordination and standards among our Universities. The University Education Commission, an expert body, which consisted of not only eminent men in the field of education in India like Dr. Radhakrishnan, Dr. A.L. Mudaliar and our eminent Professor, Professor Meghnad Saha and others from India, but also eminent educationists from foreign countries like England and America, proposed to give much more powers into the Centre over our Universities, than are provided in this Bill. I appeal to the hon. Members who have dwelt at length upon this particular point not to worry themselves, not to get agitated, not to get irritated at the idea that the Centre will have some power over our Universities.

Some hon. Members have raised the issue as to why two different functions, namely maintenance of co-ordination and standards and the allotment of funds, should be given to one single body, the University Grants Commission. As I have said in my opening remarks, moving the motion, the original proposal of the Central Government was to establish two different bodies for these two different purposes. One was an All India Council of University Education for the maintenance of standards and co-ordination in our Universities and the other was the University Grants Commission for allocating the grants from the Central exchequer. But, the Conference of State Education Ministers and Vice-Chancellors, held in April 1953 unanimously recommended that instead of two separate bodies, there should be one body into whose hands both these functions should be given. Thus, the persons who are intimately concerned with our University education and

administration, namely the Vice-Chancellors and State Education Ministers recommended that instead of two separate bodies there should be one. In pursuance of their recommendation, the University Regulation of Standards Bill was dropped and its provisions were incorporated in the present Bill.

My hon. friend from Bihar, Shri S.N. Das said, if I understood his Hindi correctly – I hope I have understood him correctly – that the University Education Commission does not propose to give into the hands of the University Grants Commission any functions other than the allocating of grants. He was not quite correct. I will draw his attention to page 406 where the University Education Commission says:

“The only solution is to give to the University Grants Commission the task of co-ordination, with the sanction of giving or withholding grants.”

I like to lay emphasis on the words “with the sanction of giving or withholding grants”.

Shri S.N. Das (Darbhanga Central): What about maintenance of standards? This is about co-ordination, not about maintenance of standards.

Dr. M.M. Das: Much has been made about this: withholding of grants. Here we find that the University Education Commission is in favour of giving this power of withholding grants to the Grants Commission, whenever they think necessary from the Universities. It is necessary to give into the hands of the University Grants Commission the power so that they may be entitled to withhold grants from Universities whenever they find it necessary to do so.

Then, I go to the composition of the Commission and its functions. It has been said that the composition of this Commission as provided in this Bill is not the same as recommended by the University Education Commission. It is true that changes have been made. In the first place, the total number of members has been raised from 7 to 9. This was thought necessary because additional responsibilities have been proposed to be given in this Bill into the hands of the University Grants Commission, viz., the responsibilities of maintenance and co-ordination of standards.

Secondly, regarding the terms and conditions of service, it was not possible to adhere to the terms and conditions as recommended by the University Education Commission because the University Education

Commission imposes some restriction upon the future employment of the members who serve in this Grants Commission, and it is difficult to get suitable men commanding the confidence and respect of the universities as well as the public who will be prepared to serve under this Commission, with restrictions on their future employment. Doubts have been expressed as to the necessity and advisability of having in this Commission administrative and financial experts. Many of the Members today have spoken on that question. The House should realise that the administration of universities has got two different aspects. One is the educational aspect, concerning teaching and education, and another is the administrative aspect concerning finance and administration. The University Grants Commission is supposed to be an expert body regarding both these aspects, both the educational aspect of our universities and the administrative and financial aspect of our universities. So, the inclusion of such experts is essential and necessary in the Grants Commission.

Some of the hon. Members have expressed their opinion, and my hon. friend, that the Vice-Chancellors to be appointed as members of the University Grants Commission should be elected by the Vice-Chancellors of all the Universities of India. I beg to submit to this House that I do not think that this is a very commendable proposition. An election amongst our Vice-Chancellors for membership of the University Grants Commission will not be in keeping with the dignity of the Vice-Chancellors. In addition to that, such an election will tend to create narrowness and create factions. I may submit to this House that the University Education Commission was not in favour of election. They recommended that the non-official members of the University Grants Commission should be appointed by the Central Government. I am quoting what the University Education Commission says about this matter:

“We recommend that the Commission should consist of five members, three full-time members appointed by the Government of India who can also appoint one of the three as Chairman, together with the Secretary of the Ministry of Finance and the Secretary of the Ministry of Education. However, on account of the size of our country, the varying character of the different institutions and the large numbers of courses in our Universities involved, this number may be increased to seven, with five non-officials and two Secretaries.”

The University Education Commission was totally against any important appointment in the field of education by election. They expressed their opinion rather very strongly while discussing the selection of Vice-Chancellors of universities. This is what they say. I want hon. Members who are supporters of elections to listen to me very carefully. The University Education Commission says:

“Open canvassing and voting for candidates may have been tolerable while the post was not much more than a compliment which the university could bestow, though, even so, it was undignified and led to the formation of factions...”

— this was said about the selection of Vice-Chancellors of our universities —

“...but as a measure of securing a man of character and reputation for an arduous and highly skilled service, it is, to put it bluntly, disastrous folly.”

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Is it a democratic principle that it is a disastrous folly?

Shri S.S. More: Now, there will be canvassing at the centre.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East-cum-Ballia Distt.—West): That is the opinion of the Commission, not his.

Dr. M.M. Das: I do not think these lines require any comment.

Some Members do not like the idea that the Grants Commission should be under the policy control of the Central Government. Some of the Members said that clause 20 which makes this provision is a dangerous clause. They wanted complete independence, absolute freedom for the Grants Commission. At least a few crores of rupees will have to be spent by the University Grants Commission annually for distributing grants to our universities. The Government of India is responsible for this money to this House. If anything goes wrong, then, my hon. friends opposite will be the first persons to fly at the throat of the Government of India. The Government of India will be held fully responsible for every act of commission and omission of the University Grants Commission. Is it fair, is it just, I ask this august House, that the Government of India which will have the fullest responsibility will have not the remotest authority, the remotest control, the remotest right? There can be no responsibility at all without authority, without right, without control.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Quite, quite.

Dr. M.M. Das: Many Members do not like clause 14, the penal clause which authorises the Commission to withdraw the grant if they choose to do so. This power of withdrawing the grant whenever the Commission thinks it necessary is very essential. One hon. Member quoted from the University Education Commission's report to prove that this clause will stand in the way of friendship between the Universities on the one hand and the Grants Commission on the other and added that by this clause the universities will regard the Grants Commission as a policeman. For her benefit – she is not here unfortunately – and for the benefit of this House, I wish to read in some detail so that it will clarify her point.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member reads in detail, he might not be able to finish by 2.25. Would it be possible for him to do so?

Dr. M.M. Das: Yes, I will finish. There are 10 minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Only seven.

Dr. M.M. Das: There is no end to this discussion. I can finish at any moment.

Mr. Chairman: He will have another opportunity.

Dr. M.M. Das: Some hon. Members quoted from this report. I want to show that this document has been misquoted to the greatest possible extent by hon. Members of the Opposition.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Scriptures are always liable to be misquoted.

Dr. M.M. Das: The Commission says that “they wish to see established with the universities a relation of friendship and not that of a policeman or even an inspector.” This line has been quoted, but the next two lines have not been quoted. In the next two lines they say:

“In the last resort, if a university persists in faction fights at the expense of its proper task, the commission will be bound to divert the public money with which it is entrusted into more profitable channels. That is inherent in the situation and the mere knowledge that it is so should be a steadying influence.”

I think my quotations will have a steadying influence upon the hon. Members opposite.

Shri S.S. More: You are hoping too much.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): They are incorrigible.

Dr. M.M. Das: There is another important question I would like to take up, and this is the question of taking away the right of conferring degrees from institutions like the Kashi Vidyapith and Gurukul Kangri

etc. This power of taking away the power of conferring degrees from unauthorised institutions is essential for discharging the responsibility of maintenance of standards. No standards can be maintained if every one comes forward for conferring degrees. But we must admit that all private institutions cannot be and should not be measured by one and the same yardstick. There are private institutions in this country that command great respect and confidence of the public. Such institutions also receive annual grants from the Government. Such institutions of real merit have got nothing to be afraid of. They can be declared under clause 3 of this Bill to be universities entitled to confer degrees.

Shri S.N. Das: What about those who do not get any aid from Government, and who do not like to get any degree from Government?

Mr. Chairman: I think we should allow the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to conduct his speech.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): He should be allowed, for this is a very important point.

Dr. M.M. Das: My hon. friend, Shri N.M. Lingam, was expressing his great dissatisfaction and regret at the present educational conditions in our country. Shri N.M. Lingam said that we have not evolved a national pattern of education, and that we do not have any definite objectives. With all my respect to hon. friend, I must submit that the views he expressed betray gross – I should not say ignorance, but – lack of proper information.

Shri N.M. Lingam (Coimbatore): How?

Dr. M.M. Das: It is not correct to say that we have no definite objectives before us. It is not correct to say that we have not developed any national pattern of education. So far as the results are concerned, I should like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to the different schemes that are being implemented today in conjunction with the Central Government by the State Governments all over the country, for the reconstruction of the educational system of our country. Crores of rupees are being spent today annually by the Central Government as well as the State Governments for this reconstruction or rejuvenation of the educational system of our country.

Shri N.M. Lingam: It is confusion worse confounded.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: What about the results?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let these things be decided subsequently.

Dr. M.M. Das: I have at my disposal the figures of the total number of students in our secondary and primary schools, and I would like to

give them to my hon. friend Dr. Suresh Chandra. In 1947-48, the total number of students in our primary and secondary schools was 1.41 crores, while in 1952-53, the number was 2.53 crores, which means an increase of 1.12 crores. We have not received all the figures from all the State Governments, but the figures that have been received show that the present number of students in our secondary and primary schools has exceeded 3 crores. Considering our population, 3 crores out of 36 crores may not be a very impressive figure, but when one considers the rate at which the number of students has been increasing, and the number of new schools that are coming into existence, one is tempted to think that perhaps there is no just or justifiable ground for despair and regret.

I understand fully the difficulty of my hon. friend Shri N.M. Lingam and others. Their difficulty has been this. The achievement in the field of education is not something which automatically draws the notice of the public. When a big dam is constructed across a river, we see before our eyes some gigantic structure, some awe-inspiring structure raising its head in the skies; it is something located, it is something awe-inspiring, that one can go to the spot and see it. But the achievements in the field of education are scattered all over the whole country. It is not a localised thing; one cannot go to a particular place and see all the achievements of Government in the field of education. We have to go to the remotest village to see that a new primary school has sprung up; we have to go to the farthest corner of a school building to find out that a few hundred books have been added to the library. Efforts have to be made, and troubles have to be taken to find out what has been done in the field of education. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of people who are prepared to take this trouble, to make this effort.

I have taken much time of the House. I have tried my best to cover as many as possible of the relevant points that have been raised by hon. Members in the course of the discussion. I commend my motion to the House.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 30 from this House, namely, Shri Narhar Vishnu Gadgil, Shri V.B. Gandhi, Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi, Shri R.V. Dhulekar,

Shri Birbal Singh, Pandit Algurai Shastri, Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, Shri T.S. Avinashilingam Chettiar, Shri S. Sinha, Shri T.N. Vishwanatha Reddy, Shri A.M. Thomas, Shri Rachiah, Shri Diwan Chand Sharma, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Radhelal Vyas, Mulla Abdullabhai, Mulla Taherali, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi, Pandit Lingraj Misra, Dr. Mono Mohon Das, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee, Shri K.M. Vallatharas, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, H.H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan Singh Deo, Shri B.H. Khardekar, Shri Meghnad Saha, Shri Sivamurthi Swami, Shri P.N. Rajabhoj and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, and 15 members from the Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee...

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

Document No. 32

Further Discussion on the University Grants Commission Bill in Lok Sabha, dated 23-11-1955 after receiving the Joint Committee's report alongwith certain changes and explanation made by Dr. Das on it on 22-11-1955

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): Yesterday evening when the House rose I was in the midstream trying to explain to this hon. House the changes that have been proposed by the Joint Committee with regard to the University Grants Commission Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Regarding the terms and conditions of service of the members of the Commission, two changes have been proposed by the University Grants Commission Joint Committee. By the first change, the Joint Committee propose to take away from the hands of the Central Government the power to terminate the services of a member under the rules framed under the Act. The Committee considered this matter very carefully and felt that it would not be proper to leave in the hands of the Government the power to terminate the services of a member at their own discretion. According to the changes proposed by the Committee, the services of a member can only be terminated if the member concerned incurs some disqualification according to the rules framed under the Act. Secondly, a specific provision that the chairman should always be a whole-time officer has been omitted. Regarding the powers and functions of the Commission, that is clause 12, the Committee has proposed a number of changes. The most important of these changes makes it obligatory on the part of the Grants Commission to consult the university or the Inter-University Board, as the case may be, for taking any steps which they consider necessary for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for the determination and maintenance of a standard. In the Bill that was introduced in the House originally, there was no provision for consultation with universities for

taking any steps that the Commission thought proper, but the Joint Committee felt that it must be obligatory on the Commission to consult the universities before they take any steps with regard to the universities. In clause 12, the Committee omitted two sub-clauses which occurred in the original Bill. These two sub-clauses are (e) and (g) of clause 12. Sub-clause (e) proposed that the Grants Commission may act as an expert body to advise the Central Government on problems connected with the co-ordination or facilities and the maintenance of standards in universities. Sub-clause (g) proposed that the Commission may advise the Central Government or the State Government in regard to the recognition of any degree, diploma or certificate conferred or granted by a university or other authority for the purpose of employment under the Central Government or the State Government or for any other purpose. Both these sub-clauses have been omitted by the Joint Committee. The Committee thought that these two sub-clauses, if retained, would give undue prominence and importance to the Grants Commission, which will be detrimental to the interests of our universities.

Coming to clause 14, the so-called notorious penalty clause, as I have stated before, this clause has been revised drastically. The clause, as it stands now, only authorises the Grants Commission to withhold its grants in case any university fails to implement the recommendations of the Grants Commission without reasonable grounds.

Then I come to clause 18. Important changes have been made in this clause. Originally it was proposed that the University Grants Commission should submit their report every six months to the Central Government and there was no provision in the original clause for submitting the reports to the House of Parliament. The Joint Committee felt that it would be better if the report of the University Grants Commission is prepared once a year and the Committee also directed that the report should be submitted to the Central Government, and the Central Government, in their turn, would place it before both Houses of Parliament.

I now come to clause 20. This clause says that so far as matters of policy are concerned, the Central Government will have the authority to give directions to the University Grants Commission. The Joint Committee added three words after the word policy. They added 'for national purposes'. I do not think any material change has been effected by the addition of these words. In the original Bill the word was 'policy' but they have made it 'policy relating to national purposes'. The policy of any Government cannot be framed without any purpose; every policy

framed by any Government must have a national purpose behind it. So, I think that no material change has been effected by the addition of these words.

I come to clause 26 – power to make regulations. Sub-clause (2) is a new addition. By this sub-clause, the authority of the Central Government has been narrowed and reduced and the authority of the University Grants Commission has been extended and increased in certain important academic matters. This sub-clause empowers the Commission to make regulations without previous approval of the Central Government regarding three matters. These matters are: firstly qualifications of the teaching staff of the University, secondly minimum standards of instruction for the grant of any degree by the University and thirdly regulating the maintenance of standards and the co-ordination of work or facilities in Universities.

I have mentioned only the more important changes proposed by the Committee. There are other changes which have been suggested by them and which are of a comparatively less important character. A careful study of these changes suggested by them would convince hon. Members that the Bill had been improved to a great extent by Joint Committee. Protagonists of University autonomy will be happy to find that the Committee had given full guarantee of academic independence and autonomy to our Universities and there should no longer be any fear of violation of their autonomy. Therefore, I think that it will not be an extravagant hope on our part that this measure as it has come through the Joint Committee will receive the blessings of this hon. House in no time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

“That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration.”

Shri H.N. Mukerjee (Calcutta–North-East): As I rise to speak on this very important measure, I am very ready and willing to concede that the Bill has emerged from the Joint Committee in very much better shape than when it went in there. But I fear that there are still some very serious lacunae in this measure and I would ask Parliament to consider the character of these lacunae and remove them.

I think we are all agreed that what is wanted most of all in our country today is not only more education but also better education at

every level including the highest. In this Bill which has higher education in view we find, however, a certain emphasis which is to be found even in its title which I consider to be rather wrong and dangerous. I say this because I have noticed pronouncements by people in Authority with a big 'A' which seem to indicate that there has come about in our country a very serious deterioration in the standards of university training and research and that therefore what is wanted to-day is merely a rectification of those deficiencies. I do not wish to deny for a moment that for certain reasons that we need not discuss at the present point of time there perhaps has happened a certain kind of deterioration. But when we find emphasis in official pronouncements merely on this point of deterioration, when we find that Government's mind is working more in regard to the mere rectification of this deterioration, then I have a sense of apprehension. I do want to see that there is no deterioration in our standards, that there is an improvement in our standard of work: at the same time I do not want any narrowing of the opportunities of education even at the very highest level. What is necessary is to have more and better education at every level.

I find that in the Bill there is emphasis on its title on 'determination of standards'. This, I consider to be rather dangerous. I say so because as far as the determination of standards is concerned, I feel that such determination should normally be made by the Universities concerned or whenever necessary the determination of standards should be done by such agencies of inter-university consultation as the Inter-Universities Board. I want the determination of standards to be made at an academic level. I fear that this Commission as it is going to be constituted, in spite of the eminence of the members, who, I hope, are going to be chosen for it – in spite of all that, it will have a certain kind of official savour about it. And that is why I want that the determination of standards should be done by the Universities themselves and whenever necessary by such organisations as the Inter-Universities Board.

I do not say this because I happen to have a certain conception of university autonomy. I know that in an integrated society, there can never be anything like an absolute autonomy for Universities or for any organisation. I certainly would say it from the house-tops that there is no such thing as absolute university autonomy. But at the same time I am convinced that in practice this Commission is going to be endowed with powers so temptingly wide that in the context of bureaucratic functioning which persists in our country today, I have very serious

apprehensions as to how this University Grants Commission as envisaged in this Bill is going to function.

I know that this kind of apprehension has been expressed by people who would be considered unexceptionable by even the Government of the day. For example I find in the report of the Sixth Congress of the Universities of the Commonwealth, published in 1948, a reference to the danger of political interference or interference ensuing out of a sense of "tidy-minded administration", the passion for standardisation and that kind of thing. This is something against which I wish this House to be on guard. There should not be the kind of standardisation which I fear is for all practical purposes envisaged by the terms of this Bill. In the name of co-ordination and determination of standards, there may be a kind of stereotyping of university courses and university policies. If that happens, that would be a very disastrous thing because our country has a multifarious character. In different regions it has a richness of culture which has got to be nurtured and developed and it is through the instrumentality of the universities that we are going to have that kind of cultural development.

I wish also to bring to the notice of the House the fact that this Bill envisages a body of 9 and they are to dole out at least Rs. 5 crores to some 35 universities. Therefore, I fear that in the present context of things, unless we expand the composition of the Commission, unless we change the manner of the constitution of the Commission, there would follow subservience to Government. I say this because in today's context subservience to Government would be most undesirable. I know that it shall be said in this House that today's context has changed entirely from what used to be the case before; but in certain regards I am not so very sure. For example, I find that this question about standards is coming from Government sources a little too dangerously often. It was exactly on this question of deterioration of standards that in the British days governmental interference in the universities came about. I remember very vividly something which was said by the great Ashutosh Mukerjee when the autonomy of Calcutta University was in danger. On that occasion also the charge made against the University was that the standards were deteriorating. Ashutosh Mukerjee was the man who put India, so to speak, and universities in India particularly, on the research map of the world. That was his greatest title to eminence and at that time he was a Judge of a High Court; he had not even retired. He had made a speech some parts of which I remember even to this day. He said to a meeting of the Calcutta University Senate:

“Forget the Government of Bengal; do your duty as senators of this University. Freedom first, freedom second, freedom always.” He said that when he was a moderate of moderates on constitutional matters or political matters and when he was a Judge of a High Court.

Dr. M.M. Das: That was during the British rule.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: Now, I know freedom has come to this country. I know the context has changed but in the same way there is a likelihood – I have that apprehension because our Government functions in the same way and has not changed in essentials – of interference in regard to university autonomy. Again, there is no reason why universities should be absolutely autonomous. Universities have to subserve the objectives of the nation; there is no doubt about it. But, at the same time, for purpose of determination of standards autonomy should be given to the universities. Why this emphasis on merely determination of standards? Why not on expansion of education? Why not on the improvement of the efficiency of our educational apparatus? I know there was an effort made in the Joint Committee as well as in the House when it was discussed at the first stage to bring about a change in the long title of the Bill. But that change was resisted by the powers that be and that is why I suggest this is something which we have to look into very carefully.

Then, with regard to clause 2 relating to the question of affiliated colleges the Joint Committee has certainly made an improvement upon the original formulation of the Bill and it has been now made possible on the recommendation of the university concerned to grant monies out of funds at the disposal of the Commission to affiliated colleges. But, as will be noticed by Members of the House from different minutes of dissent appended to the Report, many of us felt that this was not enough. Many of us felt that these affiliated colleges, which have been the Cinderella in the realm of education, have got to be looked after a lot more solicitously by Government particularly today. I say this because, if we look into the history of most of those affiliated colleges which were started by private agencies, by individuals or by small organisations, you will find that this is an example of educational idealism of which our country should be proud. These colleges have carried on far a long time somehow. It is a miracle how they have conducted themselves for so long. It is really a miracle how they have produced the alumni that have come out of them. These affiliated colleges prepare students for the basic factor in education namely the degree. In universities like Oxford and Cambridge it is the Honours

Degree which is most important. You have to go through the grind in order to get your B.A. Honours Degree and generally speaking, in Oxford or Cambridge a good Honours Degree is considered a great deal more estimable than a doctorate in Philosophy or in any other subject because in order to get your Honours Degree you have to go through the grind of university education which is supposed to develop character and to engender in your mind a kind of idealism in regard to the things of the spirit. Now, these private colleges which are in charge of Honours Education have done this type of work from year to year and they have been treated in a most step-motherly fashion by Government. Even today we find there is no provision for support to the affiliated colleges. We have been told: "There are 900 private colleges. How can we assist them? We have no money." Now, if I were to ask for money I may be considered to be a subversive character and therefore my appeal may be of no effect. But, the Radhakrishnan Commission has said that it is about time we shed this repetitive emphasis on the lack of monetary resources on the part of Government; it is about time we came forward and said that education at all levels, the lowest as well as the highest, has the first priority on the finances of the country. Therefore, at this present stage I shall certainly suggest that more is done in order to assist the affiliated colleges.

Now, in regard to the allocation of money so far made by the University Grants Commission I find certain indications which give rise to apprehensions. For myself I am certainly very happy that for scientific and technical education large sums of money, comparatively speaking, are allotted by the Commission. But, I find that as far as the humanities are concerned the expenditure is by no means satisfactory. So far as the figures supplied to us are concerned we find that the expenditure on humanities is very much lower than what it should be. It is a very good thing that we see in the notes of dissent a fairly well-known oriental scholar emphasising the desirability of spending more money on scientific and technical subjects and perhaps, along with the kind of pleasure that we get from reading that particular note of dissent some of us might be happy that I, who am supposed, perhaps, to represent a very material and sordid point of view in regard to the things that are important in life, am championing the cause of the humanities. I do not say that you beat down the amount of money which you have allotted for scientific and technical subjects I only say that you spend more, but, at the same time, for humanities you spend a little more.

And, that reminds me of what is going on in the minds of many Members of this House and that is about the position of Sanskrit and

all the classical languages. There was a question today also in regard to a conference of Sanskrit Scholars held somewhere in our country. I do feel that today the emphasis on classical learning is almost being forgotten. I feel that, if we really want the cultural development of our country there has to be a realisation that these things of the spirit have to be treasured and at least one classical language has to be learned fairly well by whoever is going in for university education. I know there is a move now to make Hindi the really effective State language of our country. I wish Godspeed to that effort. I hear the kind of Hindi spoken sometimes by Hindi enthusiasts; I see the kind of Hindi which is written in Government publications which have the objective of making Hindi understood in different parts of the country. I may have my own views in regard to how this kind of Hindi is going to help or hinder the development of Hindi as a literary medium. I am not in a position to pronounce on it, because I did not learn Hindi at my mother's knee; I learnt Bengali and I cannot talk about Hindi in that way. But I feel that if this kind of Sanskrit Hindi is really and truly considered to be acceptable more readily to the different parts of the country, then it is all the more reason that you also emphasise the study of Sanskrit for certain purposes. Without a knowledge, at least in a certain measure, of Sanskrit, you cannot understand many of the Hindi words which are now being sought to be made current. Quite apart from that, there is the wonderful heritage of the Sanskrit literature and there is also the great Arabic and Persian literature which mingle in the common stream of Indian culture. I wish the Ministry of Education comes forward with a really well thought out plan regarding support to these classical languages. But Sanskrit is now almost being ignored. As for Arabic and Persian, I know certain universities where there is hardly any effort to teach Arabic and Persian, and now Sanskrit is going down the drain in more or less the same fashion. That would be a terrific damage to our cultural life and I feel that in regard to the humanities more money ought to be spent by the Government and the Commission's attention should be drawn towards it.

I shall now refer to clause 5 which refers to the composition of the Commission. I consider that the composition of the Commission as envisaged in this Bill is open to very serious objection.

Shri B.S. Murthy (Eluru): I think Prof. Mukerjee has not followed the papers about the recent Sanskrit Parishad held in Tirupati. Therefore, Sanskrit is not going down the drain; it is coming up the stream.

Shri U.M. Trivedi (Chittor): Perhaps Mr. Mukherjee does not know what the Education Ministry of the Government of India writes to the different States for developing Sanskrit study. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Mukerjee is referring to the University Grants Commission, and not to a non-official organisation like the Parishad.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: I shall turn to other aspects in this Bill which are very important. I find that clause 5 is rather objectionable and requires to be changed rather basically, because I do not wish that this body of nine controls so much finance and has the means of calling the tune on the principle that it is paying the piper and therefore there is a very serious danger to the entire academic life of our country. I consider that the number of members of this Commission should be expanded and we should have the elective principle introduced much more into this. I say this because I feel that today we hear from time to time from high-up spokesmen of Government that big things are happening in the country; that there is a revolution from below and the common people are coming forward and sharing the resurgence of life, and so on and so forth. If there is going to be an educational reconstruction, it is necessary that educational experts, those who are incharge of teaching and research work in this country should themselves feel that they are participating in the direction of research, university teaching, and all that kind of thing. Therefore, it won't be too much trouble – and if it is trouble, we should not mind it – but there will not be too much trouble in having a kind of set-up where people engaged in teaching and research in the different regions have certain constituencies of their own and they elect some people. The Vice-Chancellors also can sit round the table and elect some of their number to go and work on the Commission. If, therefore, we enlarge the number of members of the Commission and if we provide for an apparatus of election of members of the Commission by different individuals and different agencies, by Vice-Chancellors or by those who are engaged in teaching and research in different universities, that would certainly be something which would give us a great deal of encouragement as far as the formation of the University Grants Commission is concerned.

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): The Radhakrishnan Commission did not favour elections in the university bodies. It had strongly suggested that as far as possible elections should be avoided in any university body.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: I know that there is some objection on the part of some people to the whole idea of election; they hold the idea that nomination by Government would perhaps be in keeping with the dignity of the Vice-Chancellors and that sort of thing. But I am placing my feeling before the House and that is that it would redound very much better to efficiency and the purposes for which this Bill stands if we introduce the elective principle. I wish also to point out that the Radhakrishnan Commission had suggested the formation of regional commissions, because, our country is so large that it is very much better if we get the work of this nature done through the instrumentality of the regional commissions, but there is no reference to regional commissions as far as the Bill is concerned.

I would refer again to clause 12. This has raised some misgivings in the minds of many Members of this House in regard to the position of regional languages in higher education. I wish to refer in particular to the minute of dissent given by my friend, Mr. Avinashalingam Chettiar where he says that the expression "national purposes" is rather vague; it is rather undefinable and it is necessary that there is in the statute itself some provision safeguarding the interests of regional languages. I support this idea, because I feel that what we need is the planned growth of our regional languages as well as of the State language. In the universities of the different regions, naturally the regional language would be the medium of instruction. Therefore, we shall want publications in different departments of knowledge. It is very difficult to bring out really good publications unless they are organised properly with adequate financial resources at the back of that effort; and it is only Government which can do it. Therefore, I feel that in regard to regional languages there should be a very clear provision in the Bill, quite apart from whatever assurances Government may or may not give in this House. I wish Government at least repeats the assurance already hinted at in regard to the nurturing of regional languages. Apart from this assurance which I hope will be forthcoming, I wish there is some actual statutory provision regarding the safeguarding of the position of these regional languages. We want publications in different languages and unless Government comes forward with special assistance for the sake of publications in the different languages on different aspects of knowledge, we shall not get the kind of literature that we need for purposes of our higher education. I also feel that what is pointed out in some of the minutes of dissent is quite reasonable, namely, that block grants should be made to the universities for a specified period of time. If yearly

grants are made and if there is a feeling that grants will be renewed on condition of good behaviour, and if good behaviour is to be defined by governmental agencies, then naturally the position would be rather undesirable. In this connection, I find from a brochure supplied to us by Government – brochure on “Financing and Control of University Education” – a reference to the position of universities in Latin America. It says:

“In Latin America, one comes across a method of financing universities by allotting to them automatically a certain percentage of the total revenues of the State and not demanding any account of how the money was spent.”

In Latin America they do this. If we can be more generous in regard to the provision of money to the different universities, that would be a very good thing and perhaps block grants for a specified period of time would be extremely helpful to the cause for which this Bill stands.

I feel, therefore, that it is very important that we are passing this Bill, and it is very important, at the same time, that we pay attention to those very serious omissions in this Bill which are still there. And I am sure the other Members of the Joint Committee, particularly those who have given notes of dissent, and other hon. Members of this House would make their contribution in order to make this Bill very much better than it is at present.

What we need is a thorough overhaul of education. And, as I said before, we want more and better education at every level. What I find is from time to time the Government trots out apparently impressive figures regarding expenditure on education and other things, but in effect little is done.

Last year a very eminent scientist, Professor Bernal came to this country on his way back from China and he gave talks, and he wrote in some periodicals in England, like the *New Statesman and Nation*. And he appeared to think, after his inspection of what was being done in China, that in China the quantity and quality of work that is being done for the encouragement of higher education was better than in our country. Now, why should we lag behind China? There is no reason why we should. I have not myself been to China. I cannot give my own impressions of what is happening there, but here is a scientist who went there and who also advised our country in regard to scientific education. He told us, for instance, about a geological university in Peking. Today, there was a question about a geological map of India. I do not think we

have yet got a geological map even of such a very rich region, as Dr. Saha once pointed out, like Orissa. We have not got that. In China I do not know what the actual position of their geological studies is at the moment, but Dr. Bernal wrote in the *New Statesman and Nation* that they have got a geological university. In Peking they have provision of an enormous university town where students reside; there are residential institutions. They are there in tens of thousands. And the number of teachers is also very high. The proportion of teachers to students, the ratio, is very high compared to ours. That is the kind of thing being done in China.

But here in our country we find things are proceeding not only at a very slow pace but in a manner which is deleterious to the interests of higher education, to the interests of everything. We, therefore, do not want ding-dong doings; we want a purposive atmosphere, a basic understanding of the needs of the country and a plan to satisfy the needs of the country.

Therefore, it is very important that we improve upon the provisions of the Bill as it is and get to start to do whatever job we are capable of doing at this particular moment. I need not enlarge upon the importance of this measure, because it is very necessary that we throw open the spiritual wealth of our country – and not only of our country but the wealth that has ensued out of the intellectual achievements of other countries – it is necessary we throw open that spiritual wealth to as many of our people as we possibly can.

That is our objective, and it is with that objective in view that I have suggested certain very serious changes in the form of the Bill as it has been presented to us today. I, therefore, support this Bill; but I do wish that some basic alterations are made in this measure before Parliament passes it.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): When this Bill was first introduced in this House there was no difference of opinion on the point that it was one of the most important measures that this House was considering; not merely because it was dealing with certain difficulties with which educationists in the country are confronted but because it visualised and envisaged what ought to be the purpose and position of education in the country generally now and in future.

The Bill, as introduced, admittedly fell short of the expectations not merely of the Members of this House or of those who were interested in educational matters; also of others who were generally interested in the welfare of the country. I have had occasions to talk over

and discuss this matter with men interested in the public life of this country, and most of those with whom I discussed this felt disappointed at the way in which the Bill had been originally drafted and introduced. Feelings of that disappointment were voiced in this House almost from every corner, and in fact all parties in this House joined in suggesting that the Bill required a great deal of improvement. The Bill, as you know, was referred to a Joint Committee and, as a result, I must admit that it has undergone a great deal of improvement. No one perhaps will claim that this Bill is the last word on what should be the right legislation for the improvement of education in this country; but I suppose there could be no difference of opinion on the point that our representatives on the Joint Committee, the representatives of the Ministry and of the two Houses, did their very best at the committee stage to improve the Bill. And, if I am not disclosing any secrets of the Committee, I may say that the representatives of the Ministry were certainly amenable to all reasonable suggestions made by Members of the Committee: with the result that two serious apprehensions which were worrying the Members of this House when the Bill was introduced, namely in regard to the autonomy of the Universities and the directions in which the Central Government could direct the Commission, had been, in my opinion, very largely removed by amending the relevant provisions.

It would be difficult at this stage for any Member to pronounce that there is now no apprehension in this matter. In fact, it will be positively wrong to do so. But whatever the language of the amendments or of the Bill, it will be conceded that much in this direction will depend upon how the provisions in the Bill are implemented by the Government and the University Grants Commission. In most pieces of legislation of this nature a certain amount of convention has to grow, and I hope that the Government and the Commission will act in such a manner that what little apprehension is left on this score may be completely removed.

I have very carefully and attentively listened to the speech of my colleague Shri H.N. Mukerjee and I daresay his experience in the educational field entitles his points of view to a respectful hearing. There are two or three matters to which he has drawn attention – of course, he has drawn attention to many matters; but in my own opinion there are two or three important matters which require careful attention – of the Government and of this House. One of them relates to affiliated colleges. I have no doubt that Members of this House will remember that there was no room for any assistance to affiliated colleges in the Bill as introduced. Perhaps, the idea was to assist only

colleges which are generally known as constituent colleges of a University. The Committee has certainly made an improvement on the old provision. The Bill now lays down that certain colleges by selection will also be entitled to financial assistance from the University Grants Commission through the University. It certainly gives room for some kind of discrimination, if I may use that term. But, under the circumstances, I hope that my friends in this House will concede that it was not possible at the very first stage for the Government, situated as we are financially both in the States and at the Centre, to lay down that all the 900 colleges would or could be assisted. But, this is a matter which deserves very serious attention. Because, if we consider the number of students that secure their degree and on whom the future of this country depends, we find that they come in a vast majority from these affiliated colleges. The constituent colleges may certainly serve as sample colleges, in order to give to the rest of the colleges in the province a kind of a standard in quality. But, it cannot be denied that the vast bulk of the student population is served by these affiliated colleges and not by the constituent colleges. Therefore, in the larger interests of the country as a whole, it would be a suicidal policy not to provide for effecting improvements in the affiliated colleges.

Another point, in this connection, which was mentioned by Shri H.N. Mukerjee was that most of these affiliated colleges are running really on very slender financial resources. Only about two or three months ago, I was calculating what contribution the public had made towards the financing and starting of new colleges and what total amount the University had received from the State Government, and I found that even in these difficult days when we are proceeding fast in the direction of a socialistic pattern if not socialism itself, the actual amount contributed by the public was almost as much as if not even higher than the contribution by the Government. Therefore, it will be seen that while at the initial stages, for the starting of a college or for a building or for hostels or playgrounds, sometimes, it is possible to secure assistance from the public generally, the maintenance part of a college becomes exceedingly difficult. I would like this House and the Government to appreciate what sort of education can a teacher impart if he is not sure that in the first week of the next month he is going to get his salary. I am not at all exaggerating when I say that in many colleges, the position is that even till the third week of the next month, the teachers are not able to secure their salary in full. Deductions are made for provident fund; but they do not go to the provident fund

account. They are sometimes spent to meet the normal needs of the college. Not merely the contributions from the college authorities, but the deductions from the salary of the teachers towards provident fund also goes towards meeting normal expenses. Such a state of affairs, it will be conceded by all who are interested in the welfare of this country, cannot create that atmosphere necessary for proper educational advancement. I think this matter deserves very careful attention. It may not be possible for the Government at this stage of the consideration of the University Grants Commission Bill to lay down something positive and definite on this point, but, while we have the opportunity, we should like to impress on the Government the very great need of making substantial grants for the maintenance of these affiliated colleges, if we want to secure the standards that we lay down for higher education.

You, Sir, may have noticed, so must have other Members of this House, that almost everybody is now an expert in education. Whoever gets on to a public platform says that the present system of education is no good. Never have I had the privilege of seeing any alternative positive material suggestion being made. The real difficulty arises, in my opinion, not from the fact of the system of education, but from the fact that the teachers are not a contented lot. We ask them to make sacrifices. We say, look at the rishis of old who used to live in the forests. Why should the teachers alone become rishis of old, living in forests like *vanaprasthis* and not others?

Shri S.S. More (Sholapur): The Ministers should first become *vanaprasthas*.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I should think so; after a stage they should become *vanaprasthis*. Nobody is willing to take this advice.

Shri S.S. More: The Ministry itself should become *vanaprasthashram*.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: It is essential to consider this matter very carefully. The University Grants Commission, I have no doubt, will vary the needs up to a point. It is good that we have made a beginning. After all, in all these matters, a beginning has to be made at some stage. I am not, therefore dissatisfied with the provisions in the Bill. Perhaps in a year or two, either the Government or members of this House will come forward with amendments. These are matters which deserve consideration. All that I would submit in this connection is, let not the Government or the Members of this House become complacent that as soon as this Bill is passed, everything about education will be set right.

Recently, you, Sir, may have yourself noticed everybody getting up and talking about the discipline and character of the students and all

that kind of thing. Quite rightly too. they deserve our immediate and serious attention. But, will the Members of this House be surprised to hear that there is no provision for hostels for even 10 per cent of the students studying in the colleges? What they learn in 4 hours, in the college, they un-learn in the 20 hours which they spend outside, there being no provision for proper students residences. They do not even live with proper guardians who may look after their welfare. The result is that while we teach them everything we can, and the Universities and colleges do their best, the students get guided or misguided by other considerations and agencies. The present environments are such that no tangible improvement seems to be possible. There is another aspect also. A college with about 1000 students has two football grounds where 44 students can play at a time. Does anybody think as to when will the turn of the thousandth student come to go play in the football ground? I feel that it may be very difficult for the University Grants Commission to make provision for this all and all of a sudden too. There are matters which the Government must consider and make such arrangements that provision could be made for hostels, playgrounds, and extra-curricular activities. Keep the students employed in their classes or at the playgrounds must be our motto.

An Hon. Member: Politics.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: When I was last in England, I made it a point to stay in hostels. When I was asked where I would stay, in a private house or a hotel or a college hostel I always preferred to stay in a college hostel in order to have an opportunity to talk to the students and the teachers. I asked a student a question. It was this. Supposing you belonged to the Conservative Party — you may not, but your people may —, and supposing there was a Communist Party meeting organised near your college, will you go and disturb that meeting; will you try to break it up? He replied, where have I the time; I would rather go to the cricket ground than to that meeting; how am I concerned with that? The position is different here. The student has no playground to go to. There, almost every college has some cinema show held twice or thrice a week. Thus, all the time, the boy is engaged in his education in different spheres. He has his training of team work in the playground, he gets education in the colleges, and late in the evenings there are some educational films which enlarge his outlook. All the time, his character is being built. Here, we for four hours is undone in the remaining 20 hours. So, this matter deserves, I think, very serious consideration at the hands of Government.

The hon. Minister is unfortunately not here, but I have no doubt that the Deputy Minister will convey to the Minister and the Government the views that the Members have expressed in this connection.

There has been a real difficulty already pointed out about the constitution or the composition of this University Grants Commission. For a Vice-Chancellor to get up and say that he would much rather like to be nominated than elected, I suppose, would not be the correct thing to do, but situated as we are, there are various difficulties which, no doubt, men in the educational field like Shri Mukerjee will appreciate. The different regions, different kinds of universities, different troubles about regional languages, all these things have to be kept in view, and a mere election at this stage, at the first stage would perhaps not serve all the purpose that we have in view. The method of election is undoubtedly vastly superior to any nomination, but in the present context of things and the manner in which education is being directed, I think it has to be kept in view that Vice-Chancellors of different regions, from different universities catering for different needs may be able to find a place on this Commission to begin with. I have no doubt that if the system of election could replace the system of nomination, nothing could be better, but I felt myself when discussing this matter at the Select Committee stage that perhaps it may be difficult for perhaps a group of people from one part of the country may come in while other parts might remain unrepresented. It is not so much the question of Vice-Chancellors as different areas in the country. It is a vast country and therefore it is necessary that at the initial stages we may give a chance so that all parts of the country may be represented on this Commission.

I do not, however, agree with the suggestion that there should be more Members. It has been suggested that the number should be increased from nine to seventeen or even in bigger number. With the experience I have had of committees I do not think that a large body of seventeen members will be better. I think, therefore, that in the present context of things, we might have nine, but the official element need not be what has been proposed. It could certainly be reduced.

A difficulty was visualised that the University Grants Commission might, even in matters academic, lay down certain criteria or demand certain things to be done by the universities which may not be proper. The matter was discussed at great length and therefore it was provided that the University Grants Commission will act in these matters in consultation with the universities and other connected bodies. By other

bodies we meant the Inter-University Board or any other body that may be constituted. I feel, therefore, that if the University Grants Commission follows correctly the implications of this provision, there should be no difficulty for the time being.

There was also serious apprehension with regard to the power of inspection. That provision also has been amended. Perhaps it might have been better if it had been amended in another way, but the Government are naturally anxious that they must have more detailed and fuller information about the utilisation of the funds. Perhaps in time when the universities by their conduct show that the money has been usefully utilised and perhaps even in a better way than what was intended, this provision may at a later date, be dropped.

There was also, as you know, the penalty clause. That has been removed.

There is, I suppose, even now a great deal of apprehension about the Central Government's direction on questions of policy. We have added to questions of policy, the words "relating to national purposes". I suppose the greatest measure of apprehension in this connection arises from the point of view of regional languages, but from the recent statements of the Prime Minister, the Education Minister and other responsible officers of the Government of India in the department of Education, I think this matter is now well settled, if I may say so, that regional languages should not only not be discouraged, but positively encouraged, even though Hindi as the medium of communication among the citizens of this vast land should also be taught. Perhaps as time passes this apprehension of regional languages will disappear. At present the difficulty in my opinion arose from the fact that some of those who were enthusiastic about Hindi might have thought – I do not accuse them of thinking – that Hindi should be the medium of instruction and not the regional languages. That attitude of mind has changed even among those who are enthusiasts about Hindi, and I think by the conduct of those who are trying to act in this direction, by the conduct of the Government, it should be amply clear very soon that regional languages also have to be developed. It would have been difficult, however, for the Joint Committee to lay down specifically that the Commission should also contribute financially to the development of regional languages. As has been mentioned not only in the report of the Joint Committee but also in the different notes of dissent, the State Government also must have some share of responsibility and the University Grants Commission should concentrate its attention on

certain other objects. Whether it would have been right to lay this responsibility of the encouragement of regional languages on the University Grants Commission is, in my opinion, a matter still open for discussion, but that regional languages should be developed, is I suppose, now a matter beyond doubt.

These are the different points which have been raised here. All that one can say at this stage is that we hope, and prayerfully hope, that the Bill as amended by the Joint Committee – and perhaps as amended later by this House – will be implemented faithfully in the spirit in which the Joint Committee reported and in the spirit in which it is the desire of the Members of this House that it should be worked.

There is just one word more which I will submit before I resume my seat, and that is with regard to standardisation. Some difficulties have been pointed out, some apprehensions have been expressed in this connection also. Perhaps I may have been mistaken, but when I read this word “standardisation” and when we discussed it at the Select Committee stage and other stages, I never thought it meant or was anywhere near the implications of the term “regimentation”. Standardisation need not necessarily mean a particular standard from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas in any subject. Standardisation would be based on certain standards which may be different, for different areas, and different subjects, but generally I have no doubt that an educationist of the eminence of Shri Mukerjee will agree that in many matters standardisation is necessary. Leave aside other things. A second class M.A. from one university is one who secures 50 per cent marks or 55 per cent marks. In another university he who secures 45 per cent marks is placed on the II class. When applications are called for stating that second class M.As. are required, the one securing 45 per cent in a university where 55 per cent is required for a second class becomes a third class. So, some kind of all-round standardisation in such directions is certainly called for. But standardisation of education in the sense of regimentation, I entirely agree with Shri H.N. Mukerjee, will be disastrous.

I hope the Bill will receive due consideration in this House, and those who will ultimately be responsible for implementing it will do so in the spirit in which it is being enacted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I forgot to ascertain the wishes of the House regarding the time-limit. Ten hours have been allotted for this Bill.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): For all stages?

Shri K.K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): By whom?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In the Order Paper before me, 10 hours have been noted, but that has not been formally accepted by the Business Advisory Committee because it has not been placed before them.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): The Business Advisory Committee will be meeting today.

Mr. Deputy-speaker: Yes, they will be meeting today, and they will fix the time.

I would like to know how much time hon. Members would like to take. Shall I confine their speeches, except in some cases, to fifteen minutes?

Shri S.S. More: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: And to 20 minutes or 30 minutes in special cases?

Shri S.S. More: Twenty minutes will be more than enough for an hon. Member.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find that a number of Members, about 30 from this House and about 15 from the other House have served on the Joint Committee. Hon. Members who served on the Joint Committee will be called later on, so that they may hear what others have to say and try to justify what they have said, or agree with them regarding their minutes of dissent.

I shall give 15 minutes for each hon. Member, and in some cases 20 minutes.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): In 1945 the University Grants Committee was formed, and it dealt with the three Central Universities of Aligarh, Banaras and Delhi. In 1946-47, its membership was increased, and it was empowered to deal with all universities. Now, we have the University Grants Commission, which is very necessary; and we all welcome it. A body for allocating capital and recurring grants was urgently wanted, and I am sure all sections of the House feel that this has been a very good move.

Government must decide how much they will allocate in the budget each year for education. Education is such a vital subject that I am sure in the budget a generous slice must be given for it, because on that must rest all planning in the future, for once we get on to proper education, we get on to the right way of planning.

About the Bill itself, I have to say one or two points. I fully agree with the hon. Member opposite who said affiliated colleges should

certainly come within the ambit of these grants because the affiliated colleges serve the greatest body of students, therefore they must find some sort of help. They have carried on so far under very difficult circumstances. More is the reason the University Grants Commission cannot leave them out of their ambit, though they have been rather more generous in the Bill that is before the House now. One must realise, however, that there are over 900 affiliated colleges in our country; and it is quite understandable that the grants might not be sufficient for all. But it must also be realised that all may not be needing the grant at the same time. So, I am sure they could be covered, if there is some planned way of coverage.

The University Grants Commission, when they look into education in India, must, I feel, give great stress to certain aspects. There are three things which they must certainly find money for. Firstly, they should sponsor more teachers, so that the proportion between the number of professors and the number of students will be very much greater. Secondly, a certain amount must be earmarked for the universities to spend on the welfare and health schemes of students. The horrible condition of poor students in Universities has been surveyed, and everybody knows that that must be corrected before we can ever build up the nation. The grants for stipends to poor students must also find a very big place in the university grant's consideration. It must be realised that free studentships, stipends, and so forth have to be made available to poor students of merit, because the fact that their merit could not be utilised just because they have no money is a shameful thing in a free country. In the United Kingdom nearly 73 per cent. of the students have got some sort of help in one form or another, whereas only 10 per cent. of the total enrolment in India have got free studentships and grants. I think this is a matter where the University Grants Commission could give substantial help.

Then, I would like to emphasise that in India as it is expanding today on industrial lines, business colleges and business universities as such must be given great stress and technical subjects also must be taught, for business itself has assumed a very different aspect from what it had before. It would be relevant in this connection to quote what the Dean of the Columbia University has said regarding this:

"That whole economy has changed, and our attitudes have changed. The administration of modern business is now concerned with the analysis of problems the making of decisions, the formulation of policies, and the management of daily

operations". It draws upon all departments of knowledge, sponsors research in a prodigious scheme and is in itself an intellectual activity that calls for talents of the highest order."

Business must be treated as a profession in India. It used to be called so far the art of making individual profit. But it has completely reorganised its outlook now, and I am sure that we must have universities that will teach students to look at things in this new way, and also train them to take their place in the scheme of things as India is becoming more and more industrialised. In this way, we shall also be able to eliminate that bogey of all degree-searching students as to what will happen to their training after they go out of their universities, for the country will be getting ready to absorb them as they complete their studies. Thus we shall create the personnel of highly technically qualified students and staff.

I am very happy to see that regional languages are going to find great sympathy at the hands of the University Grants Commission. In this connection, I would say that surely Sanskrit must find a very good place, because if we are to save anything of our national heritage, it has to be through Sanskrit. The Sanskrit background is already there in places like Nabadwip and so forth, where it is fully alive still. The Shri Chaitanya University for Sanskrit will, I hope, be surely sponsored by the Commission.

I feel that the Commission must also lay great stress on rural universities. Wherever there are colleges in rural districts, we must see that they are able to expand to a rural university, because the art of developing the villages also must be treated as a university subject. If we have to develop our nation, we have to develop nearly 85 per cent. of our people in the villages; there are lots of technical subjects that the rural universities must tackle. Soil engineering, food processing and so on. Agriculture which is a vital rural necessity must also be taught at the university level, and not merely as just some little courses, because the latter would no longer be adequate for a free India. Rural universities must be adequately helped to form themselves. If we have not got them so far, it is a shame. The University Grants Commission must make this possible.

Education is more and more a widening vision rather than just a standardised procedure. In this wider vision, although the modern universities cannot any more follow entirely the lines of the ancient universities of Nalanda and Taxila, yet they must sponsor that spirit. For, if anything has put India on the map of the world, actually it is our

universities and colleges that have been doing wonderful work all along. I hope they will go on from strength to strength, and the University Grants Commission will act as their guide, philosopher and friend, and help where help is needed but refrain from interfering where interference will be harmful. The aim of education has to be, and always is, that it shows to the students the idea that:

“At the crest of the hill, I shall hail newer summits to climb.”

After this Mr. S.C. Singhal¹ and Mr. K.C. Sodhia² made some suggestions in Hindi language.

Dr. M.M. Das: I may mention to the hon. Member that the enquiry into the finances of the University has taken the first place. That is the first item.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: That is only an enquiry. You may make an enquiry or you may remain silent altogether. What is the use of your enquiry? After an enquiry there will be an allocation but where are the recommendations to be made to the universities? It is a question of making recommendations to them about their finances which they ought to take into consideration. Where is that? You may think that their finances require certain improvement and then you may allocate to them Rs. 25,000 or one lakh. But where is their recommendation which they should take into consideration. That is the point which I want to bring to the notice of this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There seems to be a recommendation here.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: That is a very good recommendation and I am in favour of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understood the hon. Member to mean that there was no clause here providing for this.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I say that there is a clause: it is a very good clause and I entirely agree with it. That is what I wanted to submit. I have done.

Shri S.S. More: This question of education and particularly higher education has assumed great importance and as we develop towards the goal of socialistic pattern and increased industrialisation, it is a question which will assume progressively expanding importance. In the past different enquiries have been undertaken even by the Britishers for the purpose of giving proper shape and form to the university education. Right from 1854 the year of Sir Charles Wood's Despatch to the time of the Sergeant Committee's report which was the last report of the

1. Member of Lok Sabha from Aligarh (U.P.).

2. Member of Lok Sabha from Sagar (Central Provinces).

regime of the Britisher, different proposals have been advanced for the purpose of improving the university education and for the purpose of giving it a progressively greater technical bias. And yet no improvement took place. But my difficulty, as far as this Bill is concerned, is: will this Bill and the University Grants Commission that we want to bring into existence help to achieve the object which we have in view? The object is great, noble and will receive support from every quarter of the country but the instrument that you are fashioning for serving that objective, whether that instrument is strong enough, potent enough to meet the objective or to canvass the objective is the real question that we will have to face in this country.

The functions described in clauses 12 and 13 will necessarily force this Commission to practise a sort of tight rope dancing. It will at the outset invite opposition from the States because education is a State subject and they are very sensitive to their provincial autonomy. They will say that this University Grants Commission is likely to put their own finger in the pie of provincial subject and that is why they will react adversely.

There is another aspect also. What about the attitude of the universities? Even the universities will not look with favour, except when they receive a fat cheque from the Commission, at the activities of the Commission because, they in their own way, are also very much vigilant about their own autonomy and they do not want any interference particularly from the Government quarters. Now, it is quite open to argue that this University Grants Commission is a body independent of the executive government. But, the composition that the Joint Committee has recommended in clause 12 – whether you designed it or not – makes the body entirely subordinate to the executive Government. The composition is like this. Nine members are to be appointed on the Commission. The original Bill said: “Not more than nine” and the Joint Committee has effected the only change in that they have fixed nine as the final figure. The Radhakrishnan Commission recommended a Commission of five members. My friend Shri H.N. Mukerjee is in favour of expanding the number to 17. I am not in favour of expanding this number till we have some experience of how this Commission functions because merely multiplying jobs in the gift of Government is not a service to the country but only adding to the strength of the executive government, as far as distribution of patronage is concerned. Therefore, I would accept, as a matter of compromise, the number to be nine. But, how are you going to appoint them? Unfortunately, nomination has become a sort of craze with some of us though we were

the most vociferous in condemning nomination. Now, why should we have nomination? Because it is argued in the holy precincts of education there should not be this ugly scramble for power through the method of election. But, this executive government itself has come to power and is made to remain in the saddle of power by the method of election. The doors which welcomed the executive government into power should not be closed as far as educational institutions are concerned. Election was one of the strong and potent weapons of political education and even the Vice-Chancellor should not be chary about, or should not feel it derogatory to their dignity, prestige or position if they are required to fight certain elections.

Here all the nine persons are to be appointed by the Government. I would not blame the Government for this but from our past experience of how nomination was used by the Britishers we have developed a sort of opposition to nomination. Appointment by Government means that it is the sacred duty of the appointee to tow the line of Government whether it is right or wrong. That is the feeling that we have developed in this country. Unless we make it quite safe for nominated or appointed members to retain unaffected their original independence it is difficult to expect that such persons will be discharging in an independent manner their responsibility to the country and to the sacred cause of education. I would rather urge on the present Government that they change this composition and introduce the element of election. They have got their own representatives on this Grants Commission. By nominating everybody we should not be made a tool to carry out whatever the Government decides or orders.

Then, in addition to this feature of appointment there is clause 20 which also will give the Government a supreme hand as far as dictation of policy is concerned. Here it is said: "relating to national purposes". Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as a lawyer I would appeal to you to tell me, is it possible to define precisely the connotation of the expression "national purposes"? What is a national purpose? I, as a lawyer, fail to understand, but that may be due to my own deficiency and I would look to your superior knowledge, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, to give me some idea whether this expression "national purpose" is capable of carrying any legal connotation which is capable of being interpreted because there is likely to be conflict.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Government desires.

Shri S.S. More: The whole path will be beset with so many conflicts: University Grants Commission *versus* State; University Grants

Commission *versus* universities and now University Grants Commission *versus* the Central Government. When there is conflict between the University Grants Commission and the Central Government regarding what is "national purpose" then in such disputes, according to sub-clause (ii) of clause 20, it is the will or the order of the Central Government which is the deciding factor. My submission is, let the Government have the whip hand.

Dr. M.M. Das: I may refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Radhakrishnan (University Education) Commission of 1948 which has thrown light upon this question as to what is a national purpose.

Shri S.S. More: I have the greatest respect for the recommendations of that Commission but I feel as a lawyer – and many lawyers will be prepared to agree with me – that in spite of what they have said, when the question of interpretation of the word "national" crops up it will be extremely difficult even for the Central Government to prescribe the definite bounds within which these purposes are to be placed.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): You want deletion of these words?

Shri S.S. More: I would not ask for deletion but let them be substituted by more suitable words which are capable of proper interpretation. That is my submission.

Then, I would further say that the period of a Commission's member is six years and the Government have, so to say, surrendered, on the recommendation of the Joint Committee, the power of removing a member. Of course, they may prescribe disqualifications but disqualifications will have to be something definite unless a member incurs that sort of disqualification he will not be capable of being removed. If you want to have nomination then the necessary corollary to that is – I do not want you to have nomination – that the Government also must be given the power of removing that member, if necessary, for reasons to be recorded. Otherwise, a member may go to the Grants Commission which is a body of nine members but he may not be to the satisfaction of either the Central Government or the different State Governments and the universities. All the same everybody will be impotent to remove him with the result that he will be a spoke in the wheel obstructing or putting some other impediment.

Dr. M.M. Das: Are we to interpret the hon. Member that he wants that members appointed by the Government to be at the mercy of the Government and the Government should have the authority to terminate their service at their own discretion?

Shri S.S. More: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary himself knows that under so many statutes the Government have power of appointment and the Government have the power of removal also. These two features are usual: the conferment of the power of appointing and the power of removing. If he is pleased to say that the members who are liable to be removed by Government are not placed at the mercy of the Government, then I am prepared to accept his interpretation. I would only make a request that in other statutes also the power of removal should be removed so as to give complete independence to the members concerned.

As far as the six-year period is concerned, I think it ought to be shortened. In view of the great responsibilities, it is quite possible that after the termination of say, three years, a member may offer himself for being appointed, if his services are good and valuable and deserve to be continued. To keep him at one stretch for a period of six years is more than what is necessary and to that extent I would request that the period of six years may be shortened.

Coming to clause 12, I feel that the functions of the Commission do need some precise and concretised formulation. As far as I am concerned, I do not find in this Bill any specific mention of rural education or rural universities. All the 35 universities, I understand, belong to the urban areas and they are situated in the urban areas. All the constituent colleges and all the affiliated and other colleges together totalling 900 also come from urban areas. What is to happen to the rural problems?

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Sir, I rise on a point of order. I want to ask before you vacate the Chair whether the person who occupies the Chair after you is bound by the list of speakers which is already with you, or whether any Member who rises and catches the eye of the Chair, is entitled to speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order here, but all the same, I am bound to clear up some misunderstandings. No person who is sitting in the Chair for the time being is bound by any direction given by the person occupying the Chair earlier. I may tell the hon. Member that if I were here and should continue to be here, I shall try to balance things, by calling some from here, some from there, some who have spoken in the Joint Committee and some others who have not been on the Joint Committee and shall try to distribute as much as possible so as to maintain the level of the debate. Secondly, I would give opportunities to those who have not taken part, and thirdly, give opportunities to

those who have already taken part in the Committee but who may wish to explain their position here and fourthly, I would choose the Members on other important considerations as well. If any particular Member says that he has particularly prepared for this discussion, I have absolutely no objection. All Members will be taken into consideration, but they must realise that there are 500 Members and so every Member cannot be called. There is no intention not to allow any Member to speak. I am always having an eye upon all those Members who have not spoken so far and to the best of my ability I am trying to distribute the time to all Members. No hon. Member who occupies the Chair as Chairman or Speaker or Deputy-Speaker is bound by any directions, but normally, if I should continue in the Chair, I would follow the procedure which I mentioned just now. I have already noted whom I should call and in what particular order. Thereafter, others will be called. If in the meanwhile, a Member who sits on one side feels that he is an extraordinary Member, and that he ought to be called, he will certainly be called.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I was obliged to ask this question because every time when we from this side rise to catch the eye of the Chair, according to the practice of democracy, we are told by the Chair or any other Member who is occupying the Chair that he has been given a list and that he is bound by that list of persons. It is not a question of any Member being an extraordinary Member, because every Member is entitled to speak and every Member is supposed to have extraordinary knowledge on every subject.

Secondly, it is our experience that every time it so happens that every person who occupies the Chair – it is no reflection on the person occupying the Chair – starts from the left side there and ends up here, at the front of the right side. They never see further outside this circle. We really do not know how Members on this side can exercise their right to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is so good and he is on the right side and so he always catches my eye. But he has not risen nor has he sent a chit. He has not given me any indication to speak. For instance, the hon. Member next to Shri B.K. Das stood. He has not sent me a chit. I did not know his name. I sent the Marshal to ascertain his name and I have noted down his name here. If only the hon. Member had stood up once, I would have noted him. I have got 20 names on my list now. Nobody is missed. I have noted down the names of all hon. Members who have stood, and I am trying to apportion the time to them. You are on my right side. How can I ignore it?

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): I would like to point out a glaring fact that there is lack of quorum in the House.

Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore-Reserved— Sch. Castes): Only very few Members like Shri S.S. More are getting chances and they are getting repeated chances on all debates, whether they are on the Select Committee or not, whereas other Members who have not spoken are not given a chance to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Occasionally it so happens that the Opposition gets more chances.

Shri S.S. More: Some get a chance to speak here; some others are getting a chance to go to foreign countries, which is more substantial.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not concerned with the other aspect. Members will realise that occasionally Members of the Opposition get more chances, because they are smaller in number than the number on the other side. We will proceed with the debate. I am sure that within the time allotted, all hon. Members who have risen so far or who have indicated their desire to speak will have an opportunity to speak. That is my desire and I shall try to fulfil it.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): Are we to conclude that only protestants will get chance or even mute Members will get a chance?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Invocations will also be heard in this House!

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Distt. — North): Will the Members who may rise hereafter get a chance to speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Up to the time when the Minister replies, provided there is time, whoever rises and catches the eye of the Chair will be given an opportunity to speak.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

Shri S.S. More: Before I resume my speech, I would request you to take into account the time lost in the interruptions.

I was speaking about the functions of the University Grants Commission. I find that no specific mention regarding rural universities has been made. Unfortunately, there is hardly any university which can be said to be a rural university. The people living in the urban areas are getting all the chances to go to the apex of the educational pyramid with the result that all our activities, — educational, economic, social and other — are dominated by the urban complex. I feel that we must rescue the rural areas, particularly rural education, from this sort of incubus on it, and the best way for it is to develop a proper rural university. A rural

university will chalk out a course of studies which will be in accord with the rural spirit and rural tradition and at the same time will be effective so as to take the rural tradition and at the same time will be in accord with the rural areas to a modern, scientific plane. Imposing our urban conceptions and urban outlook and urban approach to life on rural areas is creating a sort of conflict in society, with the result that the rural people find themselves at sea and they have lost all interest in their lives. If the young people from the rural areas are to be properly educated and trained to shoulder their responsibilities, then the creation of a rural university is highly desirable and the University Grants Commission should be specially directed to strive for that purpose.

My further argument is that the mere distribution of grants should not be the objective of the Commission. The Commission should also see that consistently with its effort to raise the standard of education in the universities, it will at the same time achieve the purpose of lowering the cost of education. Otherwise, in their efforts to raise the standard of education, in their efforts to bring about a co-ordination of educational efforts in the country, it is quite possible that more emphasis will be given, more attention will be given, to raise the cost of educating a boy or a girl. My submission is that education should not, and particularly higher education should not become the luxury and the sole monopoly of the upper classes who are well placed. The under-dog has to be looked to also, and not only should there be economic parity, but even educational parity will have to be evolved. Only when we succeed in evolving educational parity, will be successful in evolving economic parity. All these educated people are going to be our future rulers. It is the university from which our future administrators will be coming, and if education becomes the sole monopoly of the rich men, naturally since the administrators are selected from those who have the highest educational equipment, they will be mostly coming from the small but rich class and they will be a sort of ruling community. In 1833 an Act was passed for giving a Charter to the East India Company and Mr. Pitt who was in charge of it said, "We do not want to create a governing class or caste in this country". But, unfortunately, whatever his intentions might have been, our education has become the monopoly of the urban classes. It is the richer section of the community which can send their boys and girls for receiving the costly university education. I can cite an instance. There was a proposal to start a medical college in Sholapur city from which I have been returned and the organisers looking to the cost of education came to the conclusion that unless every boy or girl

seeking entrance to this college deposited Rs. 3,000 which was not to be returned no admission should be given. Initially to deposit Rs. 3,000 is itself a sort of an impossible task for a man who belongs to the middle-class, leaving aside the persons coming from the rural areas. My submission is that if we want to industrialise our country and if we want to bring prosperity to our country as far as possible, we will have to undertake a huge reconstruction effort and for that technical personnel is absolutely necessary. We, Members of Parliament, may be technical experts in talking sharp and talking as much as possible and wasting the time of this House, but as far as the other technical personnel is concerned – doctors, engineers etc. – we will have to cheapen the education by which we shall secure the number of such personnel.

An Hon. Member: Make it free.

Shri S.S. More: I do support that idea. I shall be very happy if our rulers are genuine about the socialistic pattern. In order to demonstrate that they are really genuine, they will have to make such technical education free and, if possible, compulsory for those who really come from the lower strata of society. I would make one request. Will the Members of this Commission be treated as holders of office of profit and as such disqualified to be Members of Parliament – for being chosen as or for continuing as Members of Parliament, – because they will have a whole-time job? They will be appointed by the Government. Hon. Members know that the Committee on Offices of Profit has submitted its report. It is difficult to decide whether a particular office is an office of profit. So, just as in the case of the State Bank, Government must come out with a clause saying that the membership of this Commission should be treated as an office of profit which should disqualify persons for remaining or being elected as Members of Parliament or State legislatures. Such a clause will put the matter beyond interpretation or doubt. If we have that sort of a clause, Members of Parliament will have to make it clear as to whether they want to remain as Members of Parliament and educate the people from this forum or whether they want to go to the University Grants Commission and distribute the grants for the purpose of raising the level and bringing about a uniform standard of education.

These are my suggestions and I hope that this University Grants Commission eventually as it progresses will be really strong enough and useful enough to serve the purposes which we have in view and which will be increasingly and urgently brought to our attention.

Shri Altekari: (North Satara): Knowledge and education have been held in very high esteem since time immemorial, particularly in our

country. It has been said: "One who is devoid of knowledge has been equated to low animals." It has been regarded from old times that when a man gets knowledge, he is called a regenerate; he gets a second birth as it were. But unfortunately, in our country education has not gone into the lower strata of society. What we want today is that education must be spread in the very lower strata and every person must have an opportunity for securing knowledge. Our Constitution has guaranteed equality of status and opportunity. It has also guaranteed social justice. Therefore, we must so devise our educational policy that knowledge will be available to every citizen in this land. It is true that according to the Directive Principles, primary education at any rate must be compulsory and introduced in ten years. Attempts are being made to achieve this, but even greater attempts are needed and I hope they will be made. This Bill deals with university education. We want to give knowledge to everyone; but at the same time, whoever is desirous of getting higher education must have facilities to get it. So far as the objects of this Bill are concerned, the Bill as originally introduced said that the object was that "such steps as it may think fit for the co-ordination and determination of standards of teaching and examination will be taken by this Commission." But now this has been expanded. It is not only the determination of standards and co-ordination that is needed, but an expansion of university education and research in higher branches of knowledge. This has been provided by the amendments that have been made by the Joint Committee and it has been stated that "all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities will be taken by the Commission." So far as the promotion of university education is concerned, there are about 30 universities in this country. My friend, Mr. More, just now pointed out that they are mainly urban universities. But out of the population of 360 millions in this country, only 46 millions live in cities and the rest live in rural areas. Therefore, higher education for these people is a matter of great concern and that has to be taken into account. The University Education Commission has laid great stress upon rural universities in the last chapter of its report. Though it is the last chapter, it is the most important. Rural education must be of such a type that it would be greatly helpful for the people in the villages, for carrying on their avocations and various occupations in a very efficient manner, and would, at the same time, make culture available to them. The present universities are in cities. If the villages go there, they will hardly find anything which is of immediate use to them. When

they are living in the villages carrying on agriculture and other rural industries, education that would be helpful in that respect must be made available to them. In this respect, the University Education Commission has pointed out the instance of the Danish Peoples' Universities. They have said that during the course of a few years in Denmark these Universities have worked wonders. A country which was backward in agriculture and other things was raised to a very high level and it attained a very high degree of efficiency on account of the education that was imparted by these Peoples' Universities. Universities on these lines, particularly as our great Father of the Nation has pointed out, must be made available to the rural areas. He had pointed out that while they are carrying on their avocations, they must get education. Teaching by doing, basic education, should be the type which we have to introduce in the villages. Even when these people are living in their own villages, in the rural environments, carrying on farming, building, carpentry, etc., the education that is necessary for doing these things in an up-to-date, modern fashion with the highest efficiency should be made available to them. If it is so made available in the places where they are living, in their own vicinity at cheap cost – they have not to go far away to the towns – certainly, the conditions of these people will be improved greatly. Many elderly villagers came to me and complain that their boys who go to the schools in towns, when they come back, are good for nothing. They are not in a position to get good jobs because their education is not of a high standard and because they have not gone up to the college stage. When they come back, they think that they are educated and it is below their dignity to work in the fields and soil their clothes. As a matter of fact, they are good neither here nor there. That is the way in which they fare. They may have learnt some lessons in profit and loss accounting and have solved some examples well in the school. When they come back, it is all loss and no profit. This problem of giving higher education to the great population in the rural areas can only be solved by rural Universities as have been pointed out by the University Education Commission. I think that this subject comes within promotion of university education. If it is necessary, it should be made amply clear by specifically saying so in clause 12. At the same time, I would like to point out that in this way many talents that are lying hidden in these villages will come to light for the benefit of the educated urban population also. We know of Shri Tukaram, Namdeo, Tulsidas and Narsi Mehta who have given knowledge not only to their own people, but to all generations, for ever. They are the greatest exponents of rural culture, which is as high as anything that can be pointed out in

this world. Such talents are to be searched and their abilities availed of for the uplift of the nation. Such rural universities are absolutely necessary.

Another point that has been stressed upon in the Joint Committee is in connection with research and science. That is the most important thing. Just as at one end we want rural universities, at the other end we must be in a position to attain the highest knowledge in different branches of science such as aero-engineering, nuclear physics, etc., and I may add, electronics and so on. Unless that is done, it will not be possible to complete our various schemes and programmes. Unless we get efficient persons from amongst our own people, who can do all these things? It will not otherwise, be possible for us to achieve the targets in the various projects planned. Therefore, I submit that it is desirable to lay great stress on research and science.

I would like to point out that there are the various National Laboratories, which have been recently established. They should be availed of. The Committee that was appointed to make suggestions in connection with these laboratories – the Egerton Committee – has suggested that there should be liaison between the laboratories and the Universities where scientific education is being given. The students that are receiving education in the Universities should have facilities for working in these laboratories and benefiting by that. This point should be taken into consideration by the Commission. They should be in a position to make recommendations in this respect as has been stated in clause 12(f). It is stated that when the Commission's advice is sought, it will be given. But, the Commission must be empowered to give advice whenever it thinks necessary that such steps are essential in the interests of the students and education. It should be able to make such a recommendation to the Government and to the Universities. That is one of the most important points so far as research is concerned.

It is also very important that research in our ancient culture should be carried on. We have a great heritage. We have got a fund of literature and a fund of knowledge in Sanskrit. There are so many sciences which many amongst us do not know. We do not know to what heights we had reached. If we just look at the remarks made by Prof. Max Muller we shall see this. As regards principles of philosophy he has said that we have not gone a step further than what Yaksha said in his *Nirukta* 2,500 years ago, and that we are only applying what he was able to enunciate then. We have got the greatest exponents of grammar and other sciences. When this literature is available to us, we have to benefit out

of that. We must make research into this. For this, knowledge of Sanskrit is essential. Sanskrit has all along been a great unifying influence for cultural and national unity in this land. Recently only at Tirupathy we had the Sanskrit Conference in which our President stressed the importance of Sanskrit. I would like to point out that we must preserve our heritage. We must understand it and hand it over to the next generation. This is a very great responsibility on us and we should properly discharge this. I hope the University Grants Commission will also pay attention to this and give an impetus to the study of and research in Sanskrit literature.

Another important thing, though it may not appear to be a very great one, is co-ordination and standardisation of education in the various Universities. We find in these days when admissions are sought in the medical colleges and engineering colleges, even first class students in Intermediate Science find it difficult to get admission. The various Universities are vying with one another, as it were, in turning out first class Intermediate students. We are, as a matter of fact, concerned to know whether the standard of knowledge is the same in all the Universities. That has to be taken into consideration. The University Grants Commission will have to pay attention to that. That is a very important thing. With so many universities working today, if they are going their own way and there is no uniformity of standard with respect to education, we will be groping in the dark.

Not only at the higher level, but also at the lower level, in primary education and secondary education, standardisation is an important consideration. We find that in some States students who learn up to the tenth standard are matriculated, while in others the curriculum is for eleven years, so that in one State one passes at 14 while in another State at 16, and when they go for competitive examinations, those who pass matriculation at 16 are rather handicapped as to age-limit. So, there should be uniformity of time and curriculum with respect to primary and secondary education also so that the chances, the advantages and the disadvantages should be the same throughout the country. There are also some very insistent complaints that some sort of favouritism or influence is found in the results. That should not be the case and that also should be investigated.

This Commission is to have its own funds, and once these funds are allotted, it should be free to use them for the purposes of higher education. There should be no interference. There should not be any sort of influence brought on them.

I am happy at the constitution of the Commission. Though it is not elected, it is mainly to consist of persons with distinguished and academic qualifications and those who are carrying on functions as independent Vice-Chancellors in Universities. They will be in a position to do these things rightly.

I would like to point out that the most essential thing is the availability of funds. It has been pointed out by the Radhakrishnan Commission that the expenditure on university education in the country is hardly Rs. 9 crores. They have suggested that it should be at least Rs. 21.40 crores if proper and useful education is to be given. The scholarships awarded in universities in this country hardly go to one per cent., while in England it is 67 per cent, and in Oxford and Cambridge it is 82 per cent. Here I may quote some figures. So far as Bombay is concerned, the grant to the Bombay University is Rs. 2,09,000, fees Rs. 19,41,000 – total Rs. 24,36,000; Calcutta: grant Rs. 9,38,000, fees Rs. 25,60,000 – total Rs. 41,02,000; Madras: grant Rs. 4,60,000, fees Rs. 9,69,000 – total Rs. 19,66,000; Agra: grant Rs. 40,000, fees Rs. 3,18,000 – total Rs. 4,01,000 for arriving at the total donations all have to be added. Leaving aside the central universities of Aligarh, Benaras and Delhi the others have got meagre grants. In England the fees income is 23 per cent. while it ranges from 62 to 80 per cent. in this country. The provision of adequate funds is therefore a great necessity. The Radhakrishnan Commission has pointed out that 60 per cent. must be the grant by the Government. It works out to about Rs. 13 crores – Rs. 8,69,00,000 by the Centre and Rs. 4,20,00,000 by the States. Only if this is done, will sufficient funds be available for university education.

They have also pointed out that there should be hostels in universities. In ancient times 2,000 years ago Nalanda alone had got accommodation for 10,000 university students. Even in the ruins we see accommodation for more than 4,000. Even so much accommodation is not available in any university in the country now. We have to pay attention to that.

The Commission must impress upon the Government the necessity of supplying funds, and we on our part must see that we make available to the universities such funds.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Chettiar.

Shri Bansilal (Jaipur) rose—

Mr. Chairman: I have called Shri Chettiar.

Shri Bansilal: May I know how a new Member can catch the eye of the hon. Speaker? I have been rising four times.

Mr. Chairman: A new Member like an old Member can catch the eye of the Chair in the same way, there is no difference, but at the same time the new Member should learn to wait also like the old Members.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): This is indeed a very important Bill because this affects higher education in this country.

Of late, there has been a great deal of discussion, especially after this Bill had been introduced, about the independence of universities and the right of control upon the universities which the Government can exercise. Having some experience in administration, I agree with what the Radhakrishnan University Commission has pointed out, namely that self-restraint will be called for from both sides. While the university is entitled to a certain amount of independence, it may accept guidance from the State as to the large policies that it should follow. So, it is not a matter of the university *versus* the government, but is a matter of the universities and the government co-operating in this great task. In this matter rules cannot help, laws cannot be laid down, but a *via media* and a good sense as to which is best. The fears which people might have had before the Bill went to the Joint Committee must be surely allayed by the Bill which has come out of the Joint Select Committee, for the Joint Select Committee has considered all these views and on such considerations which might have been applicable to the universities. We have made a balanced contribution in this legislation.

The matter of improving standards is of very high importance. Money is one way by which we can provide equipment and improve standards. As one of our leading scientists, Dr. Saha, said one day what we want for the higher studies is proper equipment which is not available in the universities. Our laboratories are overcrowded. Many equipments which are absolutely essential are simply not available. One of the main grounds for this is want of finance. Though education is largely a matter for the States, the Government of India has seen the importance of furthering university education and has come forward to pay large sums of money as grants to universities.

In this matter I must say that in addition to equipment which is necessary, personnel is also necessary, and due to various reasons which I need not discuss in this House, education today does not attract the best men in the country. In some countries where education does attract the best men, there is a much better atmosphere prevailing, because educational institutions are the repositories of our culture, they set the standards of our culture.

Today, there is indiscipline among the students. I am living amidst young men. I have been moving among them for the last 25 years. They are not bad. They have a great ideal before them. What is not really good is that we are not able to attract the best men who can guide the young men who come to our universities. At least in this respect the University Grants Commission will have to make a great contribution, and I hope that within the next few years the very best men and women in our country will be attracted to university service.

If this Bill is going to succeed, it can only be through the personal factor. While it is true that finance is necessary, and also equipment is necessary, yet more necessary than there is the proper type of men, who will man these schools and colleges, and who will guide these young men and women. These young men and women have a lot of energy in them. If only they can be guided properly, they can be made to develop tremendous strength, character and nobility. But if they cannot be guided properly, they will bring hell to this country. It is from this point of view I believe that the University Grants Commission, which is now on the anvil, will inaugurate a new period in education.

Much has been said about the falling of standards in the universities. I have had a talk with some members of the Union Public Service Commission as also the State Public Service Commissions on this matter, and I find that this matter is intimately connected with the medium of instruction in the colleges. Once we have accepted the languages of our country to be the media of instruction, I think it has become a corollary that unless we strengthen our languages and develop our languages to express the highest thoughts, and for that purpose, if necessary, borrow also largely from the international terms, we shall not be able to create any understanding in the students who are being admitted into our universities today. Many of our boys and girls, when they go into the colleges, hear for the first time lectures in English, and let me tell you – I hope my experience coincides with that of others – they are at a loss; they are at sea, and they do not understand anything. When I was talking with some members of the Union Public Service Commission on this matter, one of them, an eminent educationist, said that we must either go back and have the medium of instruction as English in the I form itself, or we must make the media of instruction in the colleges the regional languages and at the same time strengthen English as a language though not as a medium of instruction. I hope the people who have in their hands the moulding of education will give thought to this idea. I have not put forward this idea in order that there

may be a discussion on that very point, but it is certainly a matter which will contribute towards the heightening of standards, and which will make the students understand what they are studying. And this in turn requires a great deal of preparation. It cannot be done in a day. So, the sooner we prepare ourselves for this great task, the better will it be for us.

It is with this background that this matter was discussed in the Joint Committee. There is also an amendment to remind the people who are incharge of the University Grants Commission itself that one of the best ways of developing university education will be to develop our regional languages. I was told – I was not present in the House at that time – that one hon. Member of the House stood up and spoke, and had the temerity to say that none of the regional languages other than Hindi should be developed by the Centre. (*Interruption by Shri S.C. Singhal*). I do not hear the hon. Member. I say that that is sheer madness. I cannot understand a man saying like that, when here is Shri Jawaharlal Nehru crying hoarse that all these languages are national languages.

Mr. Chairman: Today, no hon. Member has taken that stand so far.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: I am sorry if I have misunderstood. If nobody has stated like that, then I am happy. I was not present in the House when that hon. Member spoke, and I only heard of it. I am sorry if I have misunderstood the point. If nobody has stated like that, then I shall drop the matter at this.

Let me now proceed to another matter, namely the spread of the culture and knowledge of this great country. It is not to be confined to just a few people, but it should filter down to the millions of our country. That can be done only by strengthening and developing the languages of our own people. The progress may be slower or faster, but that has to be done, and I hope this will be one of the objectives of the University Grants Commission also.

With the limited time at my disposal, let me not go very much farther into these general subjects, but let me say a few words about certain clauses of the Bill. You are aware that there are three types of universities in the world. The first is the category of universities which are completely independent of Government, and which are supported by private sources, by fees, by endowments and so on. The second type of universities consists of universities which are absolutely dependent upon Government, and which are wholly maintained by Government.

The third type consists of universities such as those in America, where they are left wholly to the States, and the Federal Government have got nothing to do with them. These are the three broad types which are described in the brochure that has been circulated to all of us in connection with this Bill. But all of them insist that freedom is of absolute importance. Academic freedom is of very great importance in the growth of our universities, in fact in the growth of knowledge itself.

We have chosen to take after the British pattern. In fact, the idea of a University Grants Commission itself is something that we have borrowed from the British pattern. But there are certain differences between the British University Grants Commission and the University Grants Commission, which we are seeking to constitute in our country.

In the British University Grants Commission, no Vice-Chancellor who is acting actually as the Vice-Chancellor of any university can find a place as a member; if anybody who is acting as a Vice-Chancellor is chosen as a member of the University Grants Commission, he will have to resign his Vice-Chancellorship in the University. This is perhaps with a view to ensuring that the man will be absolutely impartial in doing out funds. Secondly, the University Grants Commission in England is under the control of the Treasury and not the Education Ministry. This is because they feel that the Treasury will be more dispassionate and will not allow the Education Ministry to force on the Commission any of the pet theories that certain Education Ministers may have.

Thirdly, grants are given with condition or without condition; and it is open to the universities to accept the grants with condition or not to accept them, and there is no compulsion about it. But there is what is called public opinion which comes into play. If any university is foolish enough to refuse a grant for development in any particular sphere, public opinion will come very strongly upon it, with the result that the university cannot afford to be recalcitrant any more.

The essence of university administration in England is the giving of block grants for the universities. The university authorities submit schemes extending over a period of four, five or six years, according to the purpose they have in view. Once the schemes are accepted, they would not only be sure of getting the money for the current year, but they will also be pretty sure that they would be getting the money for the subsequent years of the scheme also, with the result that they can proceed with their programmes unhampered by the thought whether they will have the money or not.

We have chosen to depart from the British pattern in certain respects. Clause 5 of the Bill which explains the composition of the Commission provides that nine persons will be nominated by the Central Government. I have seen people advocating elections for this purpose. But I am not enamoured of elections. Knowing universities as I do, I would not advocate elections. In the Madras University, there is election provided for to the Academic Council, and I know what an amount of schism and quarrel is there in every college. We are trying in Madras to bring an amendment to the University Act to avoid these elections and to have some sort of rotation. I am therefore happy that we have avoided election at least in this academic body.

Then, there will be three persons who would be Vice-Chancellors of universities; though in the British counterpart, we do not have any Vice-Chancellors yet we have chosen to have Vice-Chancellors in our University Grants Commission, because they are a body of persons whose friendship and understanding we must cultivate. Then, there will be some officers of the Central Government also, but their number has been limited to two only. There is also provision for having eminent educationists. So, there is a latitude given to Government to see that people who have special experience or a special standing in education can be nominated to this body. To that extent, I believe that ours is a great improvement.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: Since I have very many points to deal with, I hope you will give me a little indulgence. I would now like to refer to a few other clauses. One particular clause has been referred to by others in detail already. So, I shall not refer to it in any great detail. That is clause 2(f). Previously, the scope of the bill was confined to constituent colleges. As you know, constituent colleges are few in this country; most of our Universities are affiliating Universities. There is a large body of colleges, 9000 and odd, in this country of which barely 500 or 400 will be constituent colleges. So the benefit of this University Grants Commission funds will not go to the large number of affiliated colleges. So the Joint Committee thought it fit to extend its area of application. Then it was said by the Ministry – and very rightly – that their funds are limited, they cannot give all these 9000 colleges funds, and so let us confine ourselves to a particular type of colleges. Then it was suggested that we might confine ourselves to post-graduate colleges. But that has not been specifically mentioned in the Bill, because it was considered that we might further extend the scope of the application of this Bill

when more funds were available. I have tabled an amendment to the effect that the scope of the Bill may be extended to post-graduate colleges. I hope the Government will give us an assurance that at the first instance they will apply it to all post-graduate colleges which provide, second degrees honours courses, courses after graduation and other courses.

Now, I come to another matter – that is in relation to clause 12. Clause 12 defines the powers and functions of the Commission. In connection with this, I would like the Government to make an amendment. I have tabled an amendment and do hope they will accept it. The development of higher education is not an isolated fact; it is a fact which goes along with the development of our own languages. By ‘languages’, I do not confine myself to any individual language; I refer to all the languages mentioned in the Constitution. They are all our national languages, and the development of this great country will depend upon the development of our languages, in expression in science, in arts, in every possible way. Possibly some of our educationists have become narrow-minded to this extent that while they respect knowledge in science, in humanities and so on, they have not yet understood – perhaps it is difficult for the previous generation to understand – that the development of languages itself is the instrument for the development of our knowledge. So I would like to incorporate an amendment in this clause that money be given for the development of our languages. I need not mention this language or that language; because all are our own national Indian languages. I only say that it must be possible for the University Grants Commission to allot funds, whenever any University demands it, asks for it, for the development of any of the Indian languages.

Now, I come to clause 20. This is a matter with which the Joint Committee had a lot of trouble, namely, that the Government of India can give directions as to what are questions of national policy. Some Universities have said that no Government can give them any direction. This is not the time for me to refer to that; I will do so at the time of the consideration of the clauses. Some Universities have had serious misgivings; opinions received from Universities and Vice-Chancellors expressed serious misgivings. But to my mind, it is absolutely necessary that the Government of India – or for that matter, the government of any country – should have powers with them to say what is a national purpose. We cannot be actuated by narrow-mindedness on the part of anybody in any part of the country. While that power must be there, we

should also see – and I hope that an assurance will be given in that direction – that these ‘national purposes’ will not be interpreted to mean something narrower than national purposes. For example, a distinguished Vice-Chancellor, for whom the Ministry, I am sure, has great respect, Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, in his note has posed certain questions. ‘Is the medium of Hindi as a medium of instruction a national purpose?’ – he asks. I am sure the Minister will categorically clear it up, that they do not mean by ‘national purpose’ any such things. This is the general discussion stage and when the clauses come up for discussion, I shall deal with it; but these are matters which it is good to clear up.

There is only one other matter to which I would refer before I sit down.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I cannot allow the hon. Member any further time. He has already taken more than 20 minutes.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: All right. I will not take any more of your time. I will do it when the clauses are discussed.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta–North-west): I welcome this University Grants Commission Bill. It is nearly six years ago that the University Education Commission, of which I was a member, sent its recommendations to the Government of India for the creation of a University Grants Commission, and it is rather a pity that for six years no action was taken. Anyhow, better late than never.

I was a member of the Joint Committee and it was my duty to have attended the sittings of the Committee. Unfortunately, as I was outside the country, I could not take any part in its deliberations. I sent in certain amendments; somehow, they were lost. I would move only that amendment of which I have given notice.

I feel that the Bill alone is not adequate. Simply a Bill cannot do any good. The Bill must be made effective. The manner of working of the University Grants Commission Act has to be very carefully scrutinised. If you look through the Bill, you will find that, as it stands, almost the whole power is in the hands of the Chairman of the Commission. He is the only whole-time member; the other members are all half-timers. Of the nine or ten men who will form the University Grants Commission itself, some will be Vice-Chancellors of Universities, some will be other educationists. They will come once in, say, one or two months and then they will have to decide very important questions. We know what is generally done in these cases. Whatever the Chairman has prepared or

the staff has prepared is generally accepted, because these gentlemen, not being whole-time men, have very little time to give attention to the subjects. There was a University Grants Committee in 1948 of which I was a member.

Mr. Chairman: As the Joint Committee has reported, there is no provision for making the Chairman a whole-time man.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Only the Chairman is a whole-time man.

Mr. Chairman: Not according to the Joint Committee.

Dr. M.M. Das: In the original Bill, there was a provision that the Chairman should be a whole-time officer, but the Joint Committee has omitted that provision.

Shri Meghnad Saha: So it has made it worse. The whole thing will be managed by the office. So I am sorry for that. I am therefore moving an amendment of which I have given notice, to clause 5. I do not have the copy of the amendment here.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may move it when we discuss the clause.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Clause 5 runs thus:

“The Commission shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Central Government.

The members shall be chosen as follows:

“not less than three members from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities;

two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government;

and the remaining number from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinction.....”

“(3) The Central Government shall nominate a member of the Commission, not being an officer of the Central Government or of any State Government, to be the Chairman thereof.”

So, I find that the work of studying the condition of education in the universities under each heading, arts, science, engineering, technology and medicine, will devolve on the office alone and not on any responsible member of the Commission. I think this is a very undesirable state of affairs. I have, therefore, given notice of an amendment that the Commission shall consist of first, an executive committee consisting of

a whole-time chairman and four whole-time experts. These experts are to be specially chosen for their knowledge of science, knowledge of humanities, knowledge of medicine and knowledge of engineering and technology. These four are the faculties which are generally taught in the universities. They should be whole-time men and they should study their subjects. For example, if we take the man on medicine, he will study the standard of medical teaching in every one of the universities and will present reports to the Grants Commission and suggest the measures necessary. We find that is not here, and without that, most of the money which the Government may be giving to the Commission will be mis-spent. In addition to the executive committee, I have suggested that there should be an advisory council which will consist of not less than nine members and not more than fifteen members, and they have to be appointed just as is given here. I have also indicated how they have to be appointed. This policy-making body will meet once in three months or six months and will take decisions on the recommendations which have been put forward before them by the members of the executive committee. That was the original intention of the Radhakrishnan Commission which recommended the University Grants Commission. I shall read to you some extracts from the report of that Commission. On page 408 it says:

“It will be an expert body – ‘It’ means the University Grants Commission – The first and most essential change is that the Committee shall have power to allocate grants within total limits set by the Government instead of merely recommending their allocation to the Finance Ministry which may or may not agree.”

On page 410, it says:

“We recommend that the Commission shall consist of five members, viz., three full-time members appointed by the Government of India, which should also appoint one of the three as Chairman together with the Secretary of the Ministry of Finance and the Secretary of the Ministry of Education. However, on account of the size of our country, the varying character of the different institutions and large number of courses involved, the number may be increased to seven, with five non-officials and two Secretaries. The Commission will have to take very unpopular decisions from time to time, decisions that are bound to disappoint particular universities and provinces.... We regard their responsibility as similar to that of the Federal Public Service Commission.”

Therefore, the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission are definite that there should be three full-time members and possibly it will be better if there are five full-time members. If my amendment is accepted, it will meet the recommendations as made by the Radhakrishnan Commission. I, therefore, request the hon. Minister to accept this amendment of mine.

I have some knowledge of the working of the University Grants Commission in England. At first, they started with only one Chairman, full-time chairman, but they found that it would not work at all and they had to appoint four or five more men who were whole-time workers and who went on studying the courses of scientific education in the different universities. That is a man's whole-time job and he must have his staff and must devote his whole attention to that and then he prepares the agenda. He studies the requirements of each university and what new courses have to be opened, whether any department has to be strengthened, and so on. Where is the provision for that here? You have got nine men and one of them will be the Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University. He is a very busy man and he can give only a part of his time to this work. Probably he will see the agenda prepared by the office when he is in the train. Somebody will be coming from Madras and somebody from Calcutta and somebody doing some other work. I think in these respects this Bill is very defective. Generally you have recommended that there should be some Vice-Chancellors of universities and these Vice-Chancellors will naturally try to get as much money for their universities as possible. Men are not infallible and they have got their weaknesses. The man who will do the work, the men who will prepare the agenda, the men who will present it before the Commission, should be absolutely whole-time men, and unless unless you do it, I think most of the money will be mis-spent. I do not say anything further and in other respects this is a very salutary Bill and we have been expecting it for the past six years. Now that it has come, we shall try to make it as serviceable to the country as possible.

I am not very much afraid that the autonomy of the Universities will be at all disturbed if we have this University Grants Commission. Formerly, about twenty years ago, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge did not accept any grants from Government as they thought that it would do away with their autonomy. After the University Grants Commission has come, about 70 per cent. of their budget comes from the Commission and from the talk which I had with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, I found that they did not think that their

autonomy was jeopardised, but they all insist that the agenda of the Commission must be prepared by whole-time workers, men who are eminent in their own subjects, men who have got a deep knowledge of their subjects. I think unfortunately we have been rather seeing daggers in the air and I do not know why my friends in the Parliament think that the autonomy of the universities should be at all jeopardised. What the University Grants Commission in England does is that it goes to the universities, studies the subject there and then says that in the national interest or in the interests of the country, such and such courses should be opened in the University of Leeds and such and such in the University of Sheffield. They always have the interest of the country in their minds. I would not like to take much more time in details but I would most respectfully request the Minister of Education to accept my amendment. The recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Commission is the result of a large amount of discussion which we had for days together; after studying the constitution of the University Grants Commissions in different countries we evolved that formula. If you do not accept this amendment but keep the Bill as it is, the working of the University Grants Commission will be very unsatisfactory and it will not yield us the result which many of us are expecting.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): May I know from the hon. Members as to how many Vice-Chancellors are there in the U.K. Commission?

Mr. Chairman: Shri Chettiar just now said that there was not a single Vice-Chancellor. He has to resign his seat to accept a seat there.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): May I have a further clarification from the hon. Member? His whole theme seems to be that, whether he is the Chairman or member, he should be a whole-time worker. Is he also agreed that the Vice-Chancellor should be a full-time worker? That argument continues backwards. If he insists on full-time members for this Commission, others also must be full-time workers.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Vice-Chancellors are always full-time men. When they come in some advisory commission, they give only a part of their time, as for instance this University Grants Commission. I would not like any Vice-Chancellor to be on the University Grants Commission unless they resign their Vice-Chancellorships.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Have Vice-Chancellors been full-time workers in universities?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

After this Mr. Bansilal delivered a short speech in Hindi.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): I rise to lend my qualified support to this Bill because I feel that the problem before the nation is so complex, the difficulties are of such varying character that a Commission like this will not be able to meet their requirements.

I am of the opinion that this Commission ought to have greater powers in order that it may not only be able to end the civil but it may also be in a position to launch proper scheme for proper education in this country and see that these schemes are implemented and given effect to. So far as this Commission goes I am *ad idem* but my fear is rather that this Commission does not go far enough. It is a notorious fact that the standard of education imparted by the universities is low and it is progressive; that is to say, it is going down still lower. I say so not as an carping critic but because I have had the advantage of university education not only in this country but also at Oxford. I have also been for several years a part-time lecturer in India. I have also been the examiner for some of the universities and when I just juxtapose the standard of one university and the other the hiatus between the standards of the two universities is very great; not that we are deficient in intelligence; not that we cannot understand or tackle the more complicated or difficult problems but because there is something really wrong – I am almost tempted to say ‘rotten’ – so far as the teaching staff in the country is concerned. All along it has been stated that teachers are ill-paid. My fears are that the teachers in this country are unemployable. It is not that there is unemployment or there is not sufficient remuneration but the right type of teachers are not there. A large number of charlatans and mountebanks masquerade as educationists in this country. They ought not to be anywhere near the universities, near the senates or near other education institutions. If you want that education of the right type, and in the right manner should be imparted and should be made available to all, whether they live in urban areas or in rural areas, whether they happen to be children of the rich or the children of the poor, you have got to see, you have got to find the defects whether it is among the universities or among the university teachers.

I am not enamoured of the preservation of autonomy and independence of the universities. Is there a university or a senate where intrigues and cliques of the worst type do not flourish, where people do not manoeuvre and manipulate and jockey themselves into positions, where over text books, over examinership and over so many loaves and fishes of patronage people do not quarrel in a most undignified manner; where men ostensibly of education and of high standards do not seem

to remember that they are men of education; where persons styling themselves as professors of this language or that language, claiming this authorship or that authorship and all they do is to borrow two dozen poems and say the book goes in their names as selections of so and so containing poems, short stories or essays – amass wealth because by dint of influence of their status or their cliques those text books must be prescribed? These things are going on – dreadful, painful things – and such people ought not to be anywhere near these educational institutions, universities or senates. I want these evils to be eradicated. I wish this Commission had the power to eradicate them; power even to examine the abuses thoroughly and independently and then to suggest ways and means whereby these evils could be removed.

Therefore, my dissatisfaction with the Bill is not for what it is; but that is not what it ought to be. It has not gone far enough to see that all our educational ailments are remedied by this measure.

Now, take any subject. On one occasion I had a chance to compare the syllabus in Sanskrit of one of the Indian universities with the syllabus in Sanskrit of the Oxford University. I discovered to my amazement that the standard of teaching Sanskrit at the Oxford University was more intensive and of a much higher calibre than in most of the universities in my country. I had several occasions to closely compare the standard of legal education. There is no parity. The standards virtually in every branch of knowledge in our universities are at the best superficial. That being the position, the question is, not only we have got to think of a large variety of new subjects in which education of a most intensive character is to be imparted but we have also to raise the standard of teaching in the universities. There are so many problems associated with the universities that one cannot do justice to them except by making a passing reference.

Even the universities associated with great names of Vice-Chancellors, syndics and members of the senate have failed – I do not blame them entirely – even in inculcating ordinary discipline. I am not aware of a single strike, I am not aware of a single incident of beating of a teacher or insulting of a principal either at Oxford or Cambridge or at any other university in the West, whereas it is a painful fact that these happenings seem to be of everyday occurrence in our colleges and universities. That being so, we have got to see that those who man our teaching staff are men of sterling character who, by virtue not only of precept but example, can lay the standards for their pupils to follow and look up to. Therefore, I will not be satisfied if this Commission is manned by the

people of the same or similar ilk – call them Vice-Chancellors, call them educationists, call them what you will – and if the personnel is of the same pattern, my fears are that this Commission may not even be able to achieve the small expectations which are reposed in it.

Now, so far as the composition of the Commission is concerned, it does not interest me whether it is manned by officials or by non-officials. What interests me is: are those people of the requisite calibre – intellectual and otherwise – and who can give the requisite, proper guidance to the nation? What you decide in your Bill, with which I am not happy, is that you are going to have one whole-time Chairman, a salaried chairman.

An Hon. Member: Not whole-time.

Shri Tek Chand: I hear a voice that it is not whole-time. If it is whole-time, it would be better. I do not want this Commission to consist of like the directors of a joint stock company, gentlemen who meet occasionally, have a little gossip and then take their T.A. and their cheques. If you think that nine members are too many, reduce their number, but you should see that they are real gems in education, who understand their subject and are in a position to give whole-time attention to this onerous work that they are called upon to do. It is not a job where gentlemen scattered all over the country come to a place, may be once a month or once in two months, and sitting for a few hours or a couple of days and make some sort of suggestions here, there and elsewhere. It is a whole-time job. You may have half a dozen, or five or four men, but whatever the personnel may be, men of sterling worth who can devote to this most important subject their unstinted study and attention should be chosen. Therefore, my feeling is that this Commission will be in a position to discharge its onerous duties far better if it were manned by people who can examine the problem without any consideration of time. It is a whole-time job and a whole day job.

Coming to the clauses of the Bill you know that some emphasis has been no doubt laid by some of the hon. Members who have spoken, on the question of language. Will it surprise you to know that our languages have been neglected? Not only is the study of regional languages not being thoroughly examined and thoroughly appreciated, but even the study of foreign languages is neglected. I do not mind at all if you exclude from your subjects, the French and German languages. Do not teach those languages if you have not got the proper staff, but I have a serious objection as to how you can certify persons as having passed Intermediate or B.A., or whatever it is, in French language, when those pupils know next to nothing about it. Yet, they masquerade

as graduates in French from an Indian university. What I say of French applies virtually to any other foreign language as well.

Apart from languages, there is one important matter to which I wish to invite the close attention of the House. Recently, there was a Royal Commission otherwise known as the Asquith Commission appointed in England. They made certain recommendations regarding the imparting of education in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I certainly am surprised and I dare say most of us will also be surprised that they laid a special emphasis that all higher educational institutions in that country should make it a point that teaching in the following subjects should be imparted with a certain amount of thoroughness because they are new subjects. For instance, the subjects are: ballistics, meteorology, aerial flights, sound range, short wave study, non-linear equations reactor engineering, medical appliances, atomic energy, radiological physics, etc. — subjects virtually unknown to any of the universities in our country. With regard to rural universities or universities which should specialise in imparting education which should be of great advantage for people living in rural areas, the subjects suggested are: soil improvement engineering, water control engineering, food processing, rural arts and crafts, mineral processing, etc. These are new subjects. Some sort of arrangements ought to be made at the earliest, to see that, if not in every university at least in some, these new subjects are introduced and taught.

With respect to certain aspects of the Bill, I shall make particular reference to clause 12. I find that the provisions of clause 12 are insufficient and far from being clear. For instance, in clause 12(c), what is stated is that the Commission may advise universities upon certain measures. Then, there is sub-clause (g) which empowers the Commission to collect information; but it does not seem that it can disseminate that information unless such information is asked for. I hope my hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary will examine the language of this sub-clause (g) which reads as follows:

“(g) collect information on all such matters relating to University education in India and other countries as it thinks fit and make the same available to any University, if such information is asked for;” etc.

That is to say, it is going to be a repository of information, but it cannot disseminate that information. Here is valuable information, but it must be disseminated, if it is to be useful.

Then again, you will find that the powers given are of an illusory character and the Commission will ultimately find that it cannot

enforce its recommendations, because its capacity is advisory, and the only sanction is that in certain cases, it can withhold the grant that is supposed to be given. That being the case, my fears are that there is going to be a three-cornered conflict as it were between the State Government, the Commission and the particular university. I wish that the Commission in a country like ours where the level of education is not what it ought to be, should have plenary powers, whereby it can examine matters as an expert. Also, whatever valuable information it gathers, it should be able to place it before all the universities and see that they follow it up. It is then and then alone that it will be able to act in an effective manner.

Shri D.C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I welcome this Bill. It is a step, a very small step and a very cautious and halting step. But all the same, it makes an improvement on the existing state of affairs. I want to ask one question of the Education Ministry. Why is it not that the Education Ministry takes charge of the education of the people of India at all levels? Why is it that in name it leaves education to the custodianship of State Governments, but in actual practice, it wants to have some kind of control over every level of education. If you look at the annual reports of the Education Ministry, you will find that there is a Committee for Basic Education, a Council for Rural Education, a Committee for Technical Education, an All-India Council for Secondary Education, Inter-University Board, Central Board of Education and so on. Why are you multiplying all these committees and councils? You are doing so only because you think that the State Governments need your advice, guidance and encouragement. They need money from you also and that is why you are multiplying these committees and councils. I ask: Why do you exert this indirect pressure, this indirect control, over education? Why don't you take up the spread of education at all levels yourself? This is the question I want to ask of the Education Ministry.

I have read histories of many countries. I have read histories of those countries which have undergone revolutions and I have also read the history of those countries which have undergone a kind of silent revolution. What does the history of those countries teach us? It teaches us that education is priority No. 1 in the shaping of the destiny of any country. Even when Hitler was bombarding England there was one thing which that Government did and that was to pass the (Butler) Education Act. Even then they thought that the most positive achievement of a nation was the system of education. What are we doing here? We are tinkering with education here and there; we are playing with it. We

are not trying to be serious about it. That is something of which I cannot be proud. Here is this University Grants Commission Bill. What are these universities? Look at the educational map of India; there are some universities under the direct control of the Centre. I would say they are the "favoured nation universities" – I want to use another word, but I want to be parliamentary in my language. Then, there are unitary universities like the universities in Lucknow and Allahabad and then there are affiliating universities. I ask my friend, Dr. M.M. Das, who is piloting this Bill, "What hopes does this Bill give to the universities which are of the affiliating type?" There are 4 universities administered by the Centre and 2 universities which are unitary; the rest are affiliating universities. What will you give them? Most of the money will go to the Central universities; the remaining will go to unitary universities and whatever is left over will be doled out in a niggardly way to the affiliating universities, in the same way in which we dole out money to poor beggars. That is what is going to happen. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you also come from the State of Punjab. We have the honour to come from that State. There are so many colleges there which are running at a deficit and they do not know what to do. These private bodies are the backbone of our universities and they do not have money. There is nothing like affiliated colleges in this Bill at all. After all, the affiliated colleges are by far the largest in number, but that name has been omitted. This Bill does not give any hope to the large number of colleges that are affiliated to the universities.

I now come to teachers. Of course, anybody can say anything about teachers. This Parliament is a floor for discussion; you can throw out any number of charges against teachers, forgetting that you are also a product of these teachers. I read this morning that a deputation of college teachers went to the Director of Public Instruction at Chandigarh. I have been in touch with the teachers in universities and also other teachers in universities and also other teachers. I know there are some persons in the Education Ministry who are violently fighting for the cause of teachers – I do not want to mention their names. But I want to put one question: What hope are you giving by passing this University Grants Commission Bill to the University teachers and teachers in the affiliated colleges? They are looking forward to this Bill eagerly; they have been asking us about it. But no hope is there for them.

Then, people talk about indiscipline of students and all that. I would not talk like that. If half a dozen students misbehave, it does not mean that all our students are bad.

[SHRI BARMAN *in the Chair*]

You cannot call at the students by the same name. If there are certain persons in the jails in the cities, we do not say that all the Indians are criminals. If certain students do not come up to our standards of rectitude and our discipline, it does not mean that all our students have gone wrong. Certainly not. While you are blaming the students about lack of discipline, while you are holding seminars for discussing indiscipline, have you enquired into the causes of this indiscipline? My hon. friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, who is an illustrious Vice-Chancellor of a University in India has told you that the students do not have playgrounds. But, he does not know that there are places where, not to speak of playgrounds, students cannot afford to buy books and exercise books. We are talking of Oxford and Cambridge. I have not been lucky enough to go to Oxford. Therefore, I can talk of Oxford with a greater detachment than the persons who have been there. At Oxford, you have the system of assisted students. I was told, I speak subject to correction, that about 80 per cent of the students at Oxford are assisted students. They get money from the State to prosecute their studies. Look at this Bill. There is no provision for any such thing. I wish to submit that you should have stated here, we shall give grants to the Universities, to their constituent colleges, to their affiliated colleges and to all these things. What does the word 'promotion' mean? Will my hon. friend Dr. M.M. Das go to a public meeting and tell them what 'promotion' means? Can I do so? You should have made this word as explicit as possible. That is why I say that this University Grants Commission Bill, as was pointed out by my hon. friend over there who made a maiden speech, is, in some ways a misnomer. My hon. friend Dr. M.M. Das said yesterday that we have reduced the Commission to a Consultative Committee. I agree with him. Therefore, I say, why call a good thing by a bad name? Why call it a Commission? Why do you give it such a honorific and dignified name when its functions are not commensurate with the high name that you have given it? Therefore I say, when the rules are being made — there is plenty of scope for rules in this Bill — the interests of the affiliated colleges and students should be looked into and something should be done for them.

Some persons have been talking about regional languages. That is very good. We all want the development of regional languages. Who told you that we are not for the development of regional languages? Some persons have been talking about Sanskrit. Shri Tek Chand spoke about certain new subjects. I think the University Grants Commission

should not follow the stereotyped pattern of education. The University Grants Commission should not give grants only for those subjects which are already there. They may need encouragement. It should give grants in consonance with the needs of India today and with the needs of India? Of course, you will say I am talking like a war-monger. Certainly not. We need to study thermo-dynamics, nuclear physics, etc. You need these things in the context of the modern age. I do not see any reason why, when you are allocating grants, you should not take into consideration these subjects. Give as much money as you like to humanities, to the development of languages, to regional languages. I say, you should not shut your eyes to the fact that we are living in the atomic age. The basis of the atomic age has to be laid in the study of certain departments of science which are very vital.

Much has been said about national purpose. I do not know why some people feel unhappy when it is said that all other things should be subordinated to a national purpose. People say, I do not understand what is meant by national purpose. Anybody understands what a national purpose is. I do not know what the people have in their minds when they say that the term 'national purpose' should be made more explicit. By national purposes we mean only one thing and it is this. Where there is a conflict between regionalism and national interests, our national interests will have precedence.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: How will you define national interests?

Shri D.C. Sharma: You are sitting over there. If you are sitting nearer, I would be able to define with greater advantage to you. Anyhow, you are not interested.

National purpose means, raising the knowledge potential of our nation, raising the judgment potential of our nation, raising the scientific potential of our nation, raising the research potential of our nation. This is what I mean by national purpose. I think that if anybody has any doubt, I cannot educate him more than I have done.

About the formation of this Commission, a friend of mine just now said that the Commission is going to be a departmental affair. I have not the slightest doubt about it. The Chairman need not be a whole-timer. The Vice-Chancellors will come and go and more often, they will find it very difficult to meet. These five distinguished persons who would be nominated will be members of 20 other committees. What will happen? I have no grouse against the department. The department is doing very good work. As has already been said, this Commission should consist

of those persons who are persons of enlightenment, culture and learning, who have the national interests at heart and who can devote their whole time to this work as Shri Tek Chand pointed out. You cannot play with this important nation-building work. I would therefore say that this Commission should consist of a few whole-time workers. At the same time, I would say that this Commission should be assisted by a large number of persons who could be called a consultative body. There are so many subjects. After all, these persons will take only executive decisions. This Commission, should have the benefit of specialised knowledge. That specialised knowledge should come from a panel of experts. Our Planning Commission has so many panels. In the same manner, this Commission should have a panel of experts in medicine, engineering, humanities, regional languages, Sanskrit and all that. Unless this is done this Commission will only be an executive body which will have very little time to discuss things and which will find it difficult to adjust things properly. Therefore, I would say that this is a welcome step.

I know this Bill will be passed as it is. All the same, I would say that by being a Member of this House I have come to believe in one thing. And it is this, that after we have passed one Bill, we bring in an amendment after three months, and that amendment is an improvement on the original Bill. I hope and I pray that this great Bill should have an amendment very, very soon, after six months or eight months, and that within the life-time of this Parliament itself I should go home after seeing two amendments of this Bill so that this Bill can become as noteworthy, as comprehensive and as all-inclusive in the interests of our nation as possible.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of submission. In view of the importance of this Bill and the fact that only a few Members have spoken on this Bill, and several members who desire to speak have not got chances may I suggest that the time for general discussion may be extended? I have not had a chance to speak.

Mr. Chairman: That he may submit tomorrow when the Speaker will be here. That can be decided with the consent of the House.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: Will you kindly direct your eye to the right side also?

Mr. Chairman: Members will wait patiently.

Shrimati Jayashri (Bombay—Suburban): I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee. The

Bill aims to help universities in imparting the right type of education to our people.

The universities are meant to fulfil three objects – giving knowledge, research and character-building. I give more importance to the third aspect, and for this I agree with the previous speaker, Shri Tek Chand, who complained about the calibre of our teachers. Even the other day, Dr. Zakir Hussain while he was presiding at one of the conferences pleaded for a higher salary for teachers and also said that respect should be shown to them as this is an important factor in the erection of a fine national edifice. We know that the universities at present, due to financial difficulties are unable to maintain the high standards for which we have pleaded in this report. This is putting the cart before the horse. If we insist on higher standards, we should support these institutions, we should nurture these institutions. Some of these institutions are still in their childhood. I should say, especially those which are trying to give a different kind of education that will benefit the women. Such institutions require to be helped. I know that in our five-year plan we have not definitely made any reference to a separate kind of education for women, but every one realises the significance of the problem of women's education in the special circumstances of our country today and the need for adopting special devices for solving that problem. The general purpose and objective of women's education cannot of course, be different from the purpose and objective of men's education. In either case the aim ought to be to release the physical, intellectual and spiritual energies of those who are being educated. It is partly an end in itself because it is only then that there is full scope for the development of individual personalities and for each person to become the best that he is capable of becoming. It is also partly a means for the development of society as a whole as it will enable each individual man and woman to contribute the best which he or she can contribute for the all-round progress of the country. Here again I will support Shri Tek Chand when he said that in our report we have said nothing about launching a programme. We have mentioned about the various functions of the Commission, but there should be a personnel, as he said, who should launch such programmes to suit the circumstances in our country.

We have said in clause 12(c) that one of the functions of the Commission will be to

“recommend to any University the measures necessary for the...improvement of University education and advise the

University upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation;”

I strongly appeal to the Minister that for this purpose at least we should include one woman as a member of the Commission. Under clause 5 there are to be nine members out of which I hope that at least one woman educationist would be included because, as I said before, though the problems of men's and women's education do not differ much, still in the present circumstances we require a different kind of education for women.

We have got a few colleges and universities which are trying to give this kind of education. For instance, there is here in Delhi the Lady Irwin College which is trying to give lessons in home science education to girls, as also on nutrition, child development, home management, food, clothing and other things which is useful to girls. Similarly, in the Baroda University also there is a home science institution. In Bombay we have got the Natubhai Damodar University specially meant for women which is trying to give this kind of education to women. But the difficulty with all these colleges is to have the proper kind of equipment, the proper kind of teachers who will fulfil the aims of giving this education. In the institution that I mentioned in Bombay we have tried to approach the Government. We said that we are trying to have this kind of curriculum. The difficulty we found was finance. We were short of funds for having proper professors for subjects as also space because we require for home management a small place where the girls can be taught how to manage their homes and also for child development we require a small institution of children where a woman can do practical work. All these difficulties come in the way of giving this kind of education. I know that at present the Government of India are trying to encourage home science. They require women to go round the villages and to help village women by giving guidance and education in home science. That is why I would request the hon. Minister to see that there is at least one woman on the Commission who will understand the problems of women and will be able to help in the work of guiding and inspecting the women's institutions. When the grants are given, you will be able to do more justice, if there is a woman member on the Commission. So, I sincerely hope that the hon. Minister will accept the amendment that I have tabled in this respect.

I have nothing more to say. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): In all these problems that we are discussing now and trying to solve, I expect that the University Grants Commission

has a significant contribution to make. I therefore expect that this Bill has been brought forward with a specific purpose, and that purpose is this. We have got the First Five Year Plan; now nearly half or three-quarters of it are over; and we are on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan. Today, the social and economic needs of the country are totally different from what they were in 1948 when the University Education Commission sat and made their recommendations. Though it has not been mentioned in the Bill itself, yet, so far as I can make out, the purpose of this Bill is to have a group of people who will guide the universities and tell them what the top priorities are, what the needs are, what type of education is the crying and urgent need of the day, and what is the money available for the different purposes. That is how I have been trying to understand it. It may be that I am wrong. I hope the hon. Minister will correct me here if I am wrong. Only two days ago, a man who should know something about university senates told me that the grants set apart for education in the Second Five Year Plan have been slashed down from Rs. 1,600 crores to Rs. 1,400 crores.

Dr. M.M. Das: From Rs. 1,000 crores to Rs. 400 crores.

Dr. Jaisoorya: All right. I thought it was from Rs. 1,600 crores.

Though it has not been put in so many words in the Bill itself, yet as I understand it, the aim and object of this Bill is to lay down the priorities in regard to education. Unfortunately, I have to confess that our university administrations are inherently and essentially conservative. They do not change or keep pace in their outlooks as to organisation and the type of education, as rapidly as the social and economic conditions change. We saw that after the First World War in Europe, and we have seen that after the Second World War also. These highly centralised, or shall we say, highly situated, and highly autonomous bodies do not understand the urgent needs of this country and do not perceive how they have changed. It is therefore for Government to draw their attention to it and tell them, "look here, this is what we need; our Second Five Year Plan requires so many thousand technicians", and so on. The funny part of it was that when certain States were discussing the targets for the Second Five Year Plan, they put down the targets for everything; but they completely forgot about the training of the necessary personnel. Somebody had to remind them, "gentlemen, you are going to have this, you are going to have that and so on, but what about the personnel?" Then they said, "Oh, yes we had forgotten all about it". That is where the University Grants Commission comes in. And I hope that that is the idea behind your Commission.

If you look at the composition of the University Grants Commission in Britain, you will find that it has got nothing to do with the Education Department there. It is a wise thing that they have done. It deals directly with the Treasury. It is a sort of gentlemen's agreement between them. And their budgets are prepared for a period of five years, so that it gives the universities time to plan out their programme for a period of five years. Further, there is no Government audit there, as has been provided for in our country.

The composition of their Commission is also different from ours. There are no Vice-Chancellors in their Commission. Most of its members are active professors, who are working whole time. I do not understand the big idea that is always brought forward here saying that we should have part-time men. I say that part-time men would not do. The men on the Commission have plenty of work to do, and they have to hold full responsibility. I do not understand this miserliness of not spending a few rupees more and having more efficiency by that.

We have had the misfortune and tragedy already of the Industrial Finance Corporation where we had a part-time chairman with no responsibility whatsoever. We want for the University Grants Commission full-time men, who will be able to make a complete study of the whole problem. In England, there are about 16 members in the Commission. Shri H.N. Mukerjee wanted to have one more. You can make it one more or two more. It makes no difference to me. But I say that there is a specific function which they have got to fulfil. They are supposed to be a body of experts in their respective fields. Our country is a big country, and it has got so many big problems before it. So, part-time men cannot face these things at all. If part-time men are appointed, then the whole thing will go into the hands of some silly bureaucrat, who will simply place the matter before them for signature at some quarterly or half-yearly meeting. To my regret, I must say that the same malady is there in almost every department.

Every department here is so bureaucratised, that it does not see the changes in the situation. Of course, I can only speak about the faculty of medicine. There is such a lot of tomfoolery going on about the curriculum for medical education with the result that it is of no value to a person who wants to become a practical doctor, because it is all academic. We should find a sort of synthesis between academic ideals on the one side and the strict necessities of the situation on the other.

As far as I could make out, in China, they have been able to effect that synthesis. They have got there what they call the academic

universities on the one side, to produce teachers for the specific purpose of further educating the people; and, on the other, they have got what they call the People's Universities to meet the urgent need for practical men. I feel that that is a very good ideal for us. It is for the University Grants Commission here to evolve what is urgently necessary. Academic ideals by themselves are wonderful things, but there is no use having learned idiots who do not know the urgent necessities of the situation.

For instance, I see no purpose in having a double graduate as a bus conductor or a bus driver. The difficulty today is that we are having a lot of educated unemployed, with the result that men who are first class men academically are forced to make a living, as in Travancore-Cochin, as bus conductors or as bus drivers. This sort of problem has not arisen in China.

It is for the University Grants Commission, as much as for the Planning Commission, to lay down what are the priorities, what are the things that we want, what is the technical know-how that we want and so on. These experts that we have, the university men, the technicians, the medical men, the engineers and so on can only tell us the know-how but not the know-what. The know-what is what this Commission should tell us, and for this purpose, they should have overall powers in the matter. I have repeatedly stressed that the greatest tragedy of India is that we have got a Planning Commission which has no overall powers but only recommendatory powers. It is absurd. The time has gone now for having recommendatory powers. They should have full powers and they should take full responsibility. If the views of the administration are more ante-diluvian than those of the university gentlemen who are sitting in the ivory towers, then God help you, God help the university, and God help the country.

My complaint is that this bureaucratism is there not only in the university administration, but it is there to a greater extent in the Ministries, as far as I know them.

They do not seem to understand that elasticity is urgently needed for understanding our situation. They are tied up with British manuals of procedure, British concepts and British ideas. All that should have gone long ago. Only recently – a few days ago – a Universities delegation went to China and came back. Let the Ministry ask them what is their opinion, how we can apply this elasticity of thinking, elasticity of organisation. After all, the fate of India is to be decided in the next ten years, and in those ten years it is essential so that we know

how to adapt ourselves. Academic ideals can remain. I too have a great desire for academic ideals, but I am not prepared to sacrifice the essential needs of the country now. And for that I am prepared to give the Commission full powers, to tell the Universities: "We want this, we want that; we will give you money." This is how I am looking at it. I do not make a big tapeworm of casuistry out of it. Let us look at the facts of this country today. Thousands of young men are wanting a job. Thousands of young men are not trained for the job. And in the next three years you will require thousands of men for a new type of education, rural and technical, which today no University knows anything about. We have to tell the Commission: 'We want you to find out ways and means. We will give you money.' This is how I am looking at it. I am not worried about this talk about academic freedom. It is all relative. Today what the country wants is a definite plan, and if the Ministries cannot do it, then what are they there for? That is what I want. I am prepared to give my wholehearted support for a Commission composed entirely of full timers. Part-time members, part-time lecturers, part-time directors, part-time Vice-Chancellors – we do not want all that. They must be held responsible to deliver the goods within a specified time.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): What about part-time Ministers?

Dr. Jaisoorya: This is how I look at the situation. This is how I look at the problem, and I am not prepared to have long debates on nothing at all.

Mr. Chairman:¹ Order, order. The scope of the Bill, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, is very limited. The hon. Member can touch on the provisions as they have emerged from the Joint Committee. This is not in the nature of a general discussion. So far as the educational system in general is concerned, that is not a point of view which the hon. Member can press today. It is confined to the provisions of the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma: I beg pardon of the Chair. I am referring to the powers and duties of the Commission, and I also request the House to take into consideration the fact that Ayurveda also requires encouragement at the hands of the University Grants Commission.

Mr. Chairman: Is that precluded by the Bill?

1. After a remark of Mr. Nandlal Sharma in Hindi language.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: How is it relevant?

Mr. Nand Lal Sharma again started to speak in Hindi. Material not included.

Mr. Chairman: Shri V.B. Gandhi.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: Before he begins his speech...

Shri K.K. Basu: His mind is in Bombay State perhaps.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: There is one genuine complaint that those Members who were on the Joint Committee have monopolised the whole show today. There must be some limit and out of the five hundred Members, if those Members of the Joint Committee are to express their views again here, then we will be left out.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): Yes, this is not fair, Sir.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: This is a very humble request which I make to you, Sir, You can look into the list. Shri D.C. Sharma has had his say, Shri V.B. Gandhi is going to have his say and he must be allowed to speak. They were on the Joint Committee.

Mr. Chairman: But Shri Nand Lal Sharma was not there.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: Shri Nand Lal Sharma is an exception.

Shri V.B. Gandhi (Bombay City – North): I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. The Bill before the House is a great improvement as reported by the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee has made many changes, some of them vital ones. It can be seen that the changes which the Joint Committee has made are invariably changes in favour of the universities. These changes have imposed limits on the powers of the University Grants Commission and they have taken care to minimise all risk of interference in the affairs of the universities on the part of the University Grants Commission. When I say this, I do not want to give an impression that the original Bill was less than just to the universities or that it was unmindful of the rights and privileges of the universities. It was to be expected that in framing the original Bill, the Government was too occupied with making provisions for the University Grants Commission to function effectively in all contingencies. In fairness to the Government we must acknowledge that the Government has accepted all these changes made by the Joint Committee. Government has not moved any amendments which would try either to restore any of the original provisions of the Bill or to modify any of the decisions of the Joint Committee. The Education Ministry has been very graceful about it and our compliments are due to the Ministry. They have contented themselves with moving just one single amendment and that

amendment too has to do with something other than any of the decisions of the Joint Committee. In all these facts there is for the universities enough assurance that their independence and their prestige are the concern not of theirs alone but of the Government as well as of this House. In the final analysis the relationship between the University Grants Commission and the universities cannot be based only on legislative provisions. There have to be other things on which to base this relationship. These other things must grow and they take time to grow. We must build up traditions and establish conventions to govern this relationship. The guarantee of university independence ultimately will come from the conviction – not that Government cannot interfere but will not interfere.

I will deal briefly with some of the important changes that the Joint Committee has made. I will refer only to two: clause (2) (f) dealing with the definition of a university and clause (5) dealing with the composition of the Commission. The Joint Committee has widened the scope of the definition of the university and thereby a larger number of colleges have been brought in the list of colleges eligible for assistance and grants from the Commission. These colleges are going to be what are called recognised colleges – recognised on the recommendation of the universities concerned. So far, so good. But that does not complete the task of the Government or of the Commission. A very large number of affiliated colleges will still be outside that list. We all know from our experience that almost all these affiliated colleges deserve central assistance from the Commission. Their need is as great perhaps as the need of those few fortunate colleges which would be recommended by the Universities as 'recognised' for receiving grants from the Commission. I only hope that the task will continue. Government will not forget these vast number of affiliated colleges.

Of course it can be said just at this time that the resources at the disposal of the Commission are not unlimited. We grant that; but, from the experience of the past few years there is every reason to hope that the resources at the disposal of the Commission will increase as they have increased in the past. In 1953-54 the Central grants amounted to Rs. 1.21 crores. The next year they amounted to Rs. 1.79 crores and in 1955-56 it is expected that they would amount to over Rs. 5 crores. I hope this progress will continue. Even at Rs. 5 crores we come to a proportion of only about 20 per cent. of the total amount of expenditure on universities in India which in 1952-53 was about Rs. 22 crores. In this connection it is interesting to remember that in the U.K., the U.K.

Grants Commission disbursed an amount of assistance which forms a proportion of almost 64.5 per cent. of the total income of the U.K. universities. So, that should be our ideal.

The next change to which I would like to refer is the composition of the Commission. This composition is given in clause 5 and to my way of thinking it represents about the best solution of a difficult problem. Much criticism has been levelled against this clause on two grounds: firstly that the Commission is going to be of members appointed by Government and secondly that among the members are going to be included Government officials. It is necessary to examine these two grounds because a fear has been expressed on these two grounds that a Commission composed in this fashion will not be able to show any independence of judgment and that it is very liable to be subservient to the wishes of the Government. What are the facts?

So far as the question of nominating or appointing members by Government is concerned, I think it is not necessary for us to go further into this matter. It is enough here to state, as has been pointed out by Dr. Shrimali this morning, that the weighty support of the Radhakrishnan Commission is on the side of appointments by Government. So far as the other ground is concerned, we still seem to retain our old habit of mind in respect of what is called the official element and unofficial element in all these matters. In the context of independent India I believe we should now begin to recognise that these things have no meaning or relevancy. Take for instance, Shri Humanyun Kabir. Supposing we are confronted with him as a representative on the official side, are we going to distrust him? (*Interruptions*) Is it simply because he happens to represent the official side on the Commission? Are we going to forget that he was one of the stalwarts in the days of struggle for independence? Anyway let us examine what exactly is going to happen. Under the provision made in clause 5, at the maximum there can be only 4 official members on this Commission.

An Hon. Member: Where is that?

Shri V.B. Gandhi: It is there. At the lowest it can be only two. In the case of the other two, it is clearly stated that the over-riding consideration in the selection of these two officers will be their qualifications as educationists of repute or men who have achieved high academic distinction. Here is then a Commission which is going to be presided over by a non-official Chairman. While dealing with the chairmanship, a good deal has been said about the Chairman not being a whole-timer but it should be pointed out here that even though that specific word

'whole-time' is not there, the Chairman is going to be a salaried Chairman. In all probability it is fair to expect that he will also be a whole-time Chairman. Another safeguard is there; when once they are appointed as members of the Commission, they are going to be irremovable by the Government for their full term of six years. This is an important change made by the Joint Committee. In clause 6 the wording in the original Bill was "every member shall, unless his appointment is terminated earlier by the Central Government", but the Joint Committee has changed it and said: "unless he becomes disqualified for continuing as a member"; in other words, unless he incurs one of the usual disqualifications which go with posts similar to this.

Now, Sir, to imagine that a Commission of men of such high standing, either in the administrative field or in the educational field, will not be willing to exercise independent judgment or they will not have the courage of their convictions is to lose all faith in the goodness of man.

Before concluding I would just make a passing reference to sub-clause (iii) of clause 22 where....

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Member must conclude now.

Shri V.B. Gandhi: May I have some minutes tomorrow?

Shri V.P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): That he cannot say.

Mr. Chairman: It is better the hon. Member concludes today. He was a member of the Joint Committee. When the clauses are taken up he can have his say on the clauses. It is better that other Members are given a chance.

Shri V.B. Gandhi: I will take five minutes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: In that case he may continue tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 24th November, 1955.

Document No. 33

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

**Further consideration by the House of People (Lok Sabha)
dated 24-11-1955**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the following motion moved by Dr. M.M. Das on the 22nd November, 1955, namely:

“That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration.”

The hon. Deputy-Speaker has placed on the Table the Report of the Business Advisory Committee in which it has been recommended by the Committee that 13 hours be allotted for this Bill. Up to now, 5 hours and 2 minutes have been availed of and the time remaining at the disposal of the House will be 7 hours and 58 minutes. I am mentioning this because I think we must make allocation of time for the general discussion, then clause by clause consideration and then the third reading stage. We have, to say roughly, 8 hours at our disposal now. So how shall we divide this time? There are about 70 amendments.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): May I suggest 6 hours for general discussion, 5 hours for amendment and 2 hours for third reading?

Mr. Speaker: That will leave one hour of closing this stage.

Shri K.K. Basu (Daimond Harbour): The number of amendments may be 70; but many of them are common and more or less touch only a few clauses. So the time for that stage may be reduced.

Mr. Speaker: Shall I say, 4 hours for the amendments?

Some Hon. Members: Three hours.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: I will suggest 4 hours.

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear the general consensus of opinion. The general consensus seems to be three hours.

Some Hon. Members: Four hours.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Four hours for the clause by clause discussion and one hour for the third reading.

Some Hon. Members: Yes

Shri N.C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): That will be quite enough.

Mr. Speaker: That means, that three hours will now remain for consideration of the present motion. We will carry on this debate for nearly three hours and then take up the clause by clause consideration and third-reading discussion, the time limit being four hours and one hour respectively.

Shri V.B. Gandhi was addressing the House. I might remind hon. Members that the time-limit as fixed – as I understand – was 15 to 20 minutes. It might be more strictly speaking, 15 minutes, if more hon. Members want to speak on this motion. **Shri V.B. Gandhi** has already taken 16, but to be liberal, 15 minutes. So he will finish within 5 minutes.

Shri U.M. Trivedi (Chittor): May I make a submission. Yesterday, Members of the Joint Committee were the only persons who had the opportunity to speak. Would it not be possible to consider giving an opportunity to some Members who were not on the Joint Committee to speak?

Mr. Speaker: Certainly. The Chair will not make a distinction between Members on the Committee and outside the Committee. The Bill is in the possession of the entire House and any Member desiring to contribute and capable of contributing, will be called upon by the Chair.

[**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** *in the Chair*]

Shri V.B. Gandhi (Bombay City – North): I stopped yesterday on a reference to clause 22 (3). Clause 22 (3) provides for definition of a degree. In this connection, I wonder if we are not going into too meticulous details and in doing so, if we are not perhaps stepping on the toes of State legislatures. We should avoid any occasion for a State legislature to make a claim to deal with this subject, for after all, we should remember that education is a State subject.

Another important clause is clause 20. This clause provides for powers for the Central Government to give directions to the University Grants Commission on questions of policy.

I was glad to see that among those who spoke yesterday there was not much opposition to the principle of investing the Central Government with power to give directions on questions of policy. However, much was said about the expression qualifying the word 'policy', the expression

'relating to national purposes'. This was qualification of the word 'policy' by the addition of these words was made by the Joint Committee. It was not there in the original Bill. Some lawyer Members referred to the difficulty of defining this expression 'relating to national purposes'. I admit that there would be some difficulty in interpreting this expression. But, surely, there are a large number of questions which can be clearly declared as questions relating to national purposes. Some difficulty might arise in the matter of questions on the border line. There would be some difficulty about defining the limits of what constitute questions relating to national purposes. The background of this addition is that in the original Bill the Government was left free to give directions on all matters of policy. That was too wide a power to be given in this matter and, therefore, the Joint Committee qualified that by stating that directions could be given only on questions of policy relating to national purposes. As a result of this addition, now, Government in future will have to consider every time it wants to give directions whether its directions are on matters of policy relating to national purposes. That would certainly mean freedom to the University Grants Commission and through the Commission it would be giving protection to Universities, because, now, the power of the Central Government would be to some extent circumscribed.

After all, what is our aim in the Bill? Our aim in this Bill is to provide for a University Grants Commission that would be a high level body, a body that would be competent, a body that would be having adequate powers and that would have freedom to act and a body that would inspire confidence among Universities.

I will just deal with one more point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more point. The hon. Member has taken 21 minutes.

Shri V.B. Gandhi: Two minutes more, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry; he must resume his seat. Shri C.R. Narasimhan.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As a matter of that I was giving preference only to hon. Members who are not members of the Joint Committee. Mr. Trivedi is not evidently present.

Shri C.R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri) : I shall be very brief and to the point and take less time than is normally allowed to any Member. I wish to refer to clause 12 which relates to the functions of the Commission. As amended by the Joint Committee, it reads thus:

“It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities;...”

and for this purpose in sub-clause (c), it says:

“recommend to any University the measures necessary for the improvement of University education and advise the University upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation.”

I hope that when the University Commission begins to function this power will be freely utilised in regard to certain schemes visualised by the Planning Commission and published in their First Five Year Plan. I may be permitted to read that also here. With reference to University education, the report says:

“Overcrowding in university institutions is a problem which causes considerable concern for the very future of education in the country. Some suggestions to meet this admittedly difficult problem are offered in the Plan. The need to apply suitable tests for selecting those who should receive university education and to draw as large a proportion of students as possible into gainful occupations before they reach the university stage is stressed. It is also suggested that facilities for private study should be provided on a much larger scale than at present. The fact that the possession of an examination degree has long been an essential qualification for entering into many grades of public service has been an important factor in creating congestion...”

Then, the paragraph referring to women's education says:

“Problems concerning women's education receive considerable attention in the Plan. It is recommended that while women should have equal opportunities with men in various fields of education, special attention should be given to those in which they have marked aptitudes. For advancing women's education it is important that extensive opportunities should be afforded to them for private study and for taking the higher examinations as private candidates.

The organisation of short-term courses for women in general education and in crafts is also recommended."

This is the recommendation of the Planning Commission and five years have elapsed. I put a question to the Education Ministry asking whether this paragraph was implemented and I got the reply that it was a State subject and they had no information. I hope things would improve hereafter after the establishment of the University Grants Commission with the powers granted to them under clause 12 of the Bill. I hope something would be done for giving facilities and for removing congestion in colleges.

As far as the standard of education itself is concerned, many of the colleges have ceased to be teaching institutions. My complaint is that they are merely functioning as testing institutions; boys are gathered and at the end of the year examinations are conducted and marks are given. My complaint is that there are too large a number of boys and teachers are not bestowing proper attention. So the boys when they leave the schools and reach the colleges find it difficult to manage. My feeling is that the boys are not to blame but the teachers do not play their part. In several schools where the boys do not flourish, when I asked for an explanation I got the reply, how can we attend to these boys; they do not study at home; are they studying at home or are they palying?'. I know of so many boys, my own wards, who have been devoting a lot of time to education at home and yet at college they were not faring well. I find that even in the case of boys emphasis is being laid by the teaching staff on their study at home. Therefore, I think, it is not just to say that it all depends upon what they are taught at school or college. It has become a recognised practice to say that attendance in colleges and what is taught in the colleges are important and that they cannot be obtained at home. As I said before, when I approached the teaching staff for explaining as to why certain boys are not flourishing, I was asked to see that they studied at home. Therefore, the teachers themselves are asking the boys to study at home and do not emphasise much on what they propose to teach in the actual classes.

As for girls' education, the same difficulty is there and most of the girls become misfits. They are not good at home and the teaching that they get in the classes is going or, deteriorating. So, they are neither here or there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid the hon. Member has not got any personal experience in this matter.

Shri C.R. Narasimhan: I am a guardian of boys and girls. In these matters, more scope should be given for private study and the Centre should collect all facts about these things. Though the current Five Year Plan visualises some progress, nothing has been done, and Government have no information whatsoever to give on the floor of this House in the matter. I hope things will improve hereafter by the efforts of the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): I beg to draw your attention to some of the salutary recommendations that have been made in this Bill. When this bill was first introduced in this House and clause 3 was put in, to the effect that the Central Government may, on the recommendation of the University Grants Commission, declare some institutions in the country, which are of national importance, as universities, there were two provisions, clauses 22 and 23 side by side with clause 3. In clause 22, it was stated that only universities which are established under an Act of the State or under clause 3 will be entitled to any Central Act or declared as such confer degrees. In clause 23 a prohibition was put that any institution which calls itself a university today will not be entitled to call itself a university unless it is established under a State Act or a Central Act. I approach the hon. Minister of Education and stated that by putting these three clauses in the Bill, while on the one hand you are doing a good thing by proposing to declare certain big national institutions as universities, on the other hand you are, by the provision in clause 22, prohibiting them to grant degrees. I am referring to the *Directory of Institutions for Higher Education in India*, 1954, and in that a list of the universities is given and side by side a list of non-affiliated institutions is also given in which there are two classes of institutions. One class of institutions is wholly governmental and the other is partly governmental and partly private, that is to say, there are big institutions in India, respectable and influential, which are getting recognitions from the State Governments as well as the Government of India and also are in receipt of grants. Among these non-affiliated institutions there are institutions like the Kharagpur Institute, Hyderabad Institute and several others, which are conferring degrees — B.Sc. (Hons.), M.Sc. (Hons.) etc.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: What about Ayurvedic Universities?

Shri Dhulekar: These are governmental institutions. In the second class, which is recognised and aided, there are the Sangeet Vidyapith, Ujjain, (Gwalior) the Queens College of Benaras, Calcutta Madarasa, Jamia Millia, Jhansi Ayurvedic University and several others which are

conferring degrees. I approached the hon. Minister and pointed out that under section 22, you have stipulated that no institution in India, which is not a university established under any Act, can confer any degree and so you will be doing away with all these institutions in India which are really doing very good work because they are all technical, some relate to music, some to engineering, some to medicine and some are physical culture institutions. The hon. Minister was pleased to accept the suggestion and in clause 22 an amendment was put in by the Government that all the degrees which are being conferred by institutions which are outside the pale of the universities established under any Acts, will remain as they are and this Act will not do any harm to those institutions. Therefore, the Kashi Vidyapith, the Gurukul Kangri, Jhansi Ayurvedic University, etc., will be safe. The amendment purports to say that the Government will issue a notification in which a list of degrees will be given, and only those degrees cannot be conferred by other universities or institutions.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: Where is that stated?

Shri Dhulekar: In clause 22, it is stated:

“For the purposes of the section, ‘degree’ means any such degree as may, with the previous approval of the Central Government, be specified in this behalf by the Commission by notification in the Official Gazette.”

Shri U.M. Trivedi: That is the meaning that he has got.

Shri Dhulekar: The hon. Member may think that an amendment will be necessary, but the hon. Minister gave me an assurance that it means that the present universities which are established by law will go the Commission and get their degrees registered there and a notification will be published in the Gazette that these are the degrees of a particular university and that the other institutions will not be able to confer those degrees

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): I think there is a misunderstanding regarding clause 3 which says:

“The Central Government may, on the advice of the Commission, declare, by notification in the Official Gazette, that any institution for higher education, other than a University, shall be deemed to be a University for the purposes of this Act, and on such a declaration being made, all the provisions of this Act shall apply to such

institutions as if it were a University within the meaning of clause (f) of section 2”

There may be certain institutions which do not call themselves universities and which do not have a charter but it is possible that the University Grants Commission may consider them fit to receive grants for the purpose of development of higher education. The intention of clause (3) is to cover the cases of these institutions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Degrees cannot be granted. That is his complaint.

Shri Dhulekar: I disagree with the hon. Deputy Minister. All these things which I am submitting here were written and everything was submitted to the hon. Minister. There was a long correspondence and discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Member wants degrees to be granted by these institutions also.

Shri Dhulekar: My submission is this. What the hon. Minister said and what the saving clause means is this. Only those degrees which are notified in the official Gazette cannot be conferred by any other institution which are already being conferred by those institutions which are not universities today under any Act can continue to be conferred by them. There is the *Sahityacharya* of the Board of Sanskrit Studies at Banaras, there is the *Ved Tirath*, there is the *Kavya Tirath* of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, there is the *Vedalankar Acharya* of Gurukul. The hon. Deputy Minister says that all these institutions are washed away by the Act. If that is his interpretation I say he is doing an injustice because these are all national institutions and crores of rupees have been invested by all people over the country from Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madras and Calcutta.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under clause 22(3) ‘degrees’ are such degrees as are recognised by the Central Government.

Shri Dhulekar: Sub-clause (3) reads:

“For the purposes of this section ‘degree’ means any such degree as may with the previous approval of the Central Government be specified in this behalf by the Commission by notification in the Official Gazette.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore they may state to the Central Government that *Acharya* and others ought not to be termed as degrees for the purpose of this Act.

Shri Dhulekar: That comes to this. What the law does not prohibit it allows. It does not say that the Acharya degree cannot be given. Only that degree cannot be given by any other institution – that degree which will be notified in the Gazette.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He wants interpretation from the hon. Minister.

Shri Dhulekar: Hon. Minister's interpretation is nothing; it is question of law. Law is very clear. As I said earlier, only those degrees are prohibited – degrees which are to be conferred by institutions which are declared to be universities under this Act; that is, the degrees which are notified in the official Gazette. Therefore, *Sangeethacharya* degree can be conferred by Gwalior Vidyapith; it could not be prohibited. I cannot agree with the hon. Deputy Minister.

Shri U.M. Trivedi: If Bombay University also gives *Sangeethacharya* degree what will happen?

Shri Dhulekar: No. It is a question of right; it cannot be given by the Bombay University. Take the Kashi Vidyapith. It is an institution which is recognised by the U.P. Government; its degree is recognised as equivalent to B.A. Jamia Millia degree is recognised as a degree equal to B.A. How can this Act say that such degrees from institutions spread all over India are not so?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member does not find any difficulty in the Act itself. He is clear about the interpretation of the Act. He is obsessed by what the hon. Minister reads into the Act. The Act stands by itself.

Shri Dhulekar: I wish to make my meaning clear to the House. It is not a question of a Member simply standing up and expressing something. I gave in writing my views about clause 23 and I asked about these institutions. I shall refer to one case of a Government institution – the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur which confers B.Sc. (Hon.) and M.Sc. (Geology) degrees. It is purely a Central Government Institute and my learned friend cannot say tomorrow that this cannot give any degree. Tomorrow if this degree is not notified in the Gazette or if this institution is not declared to be a university under clause (3) then this degree will become a nullity.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Since it is a Government institution, I may make the position clear. After this Bill is passed, the Kharagpur Institute will not be able to confer B.Sc. and other degrees. Government will have to introduce legislation; we are already proposing to introduce legislation

with regard to the Kharagpur Institute. The whole purpose of this Act is that no institution which has not received a charter from a legislature should call itself a university. One may give whatever degrees one likes but there are certain degrees which must be accepted by the Government. That is the whole purpose of this Bill. Nobody is preventing any institution from conferring any degrees they like but they should not give degrees which are specified in the Gazette.

Shri Dhulekar: Therefore, it is clear that no institution can confer a B.A. degree except the Punjab University or the Allahabad University.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The matter is clear; any other new point may be proceeded with.

Shri Dhulekar: My learned friend has given a new interpretation for clause 23, I have, therefore, put in an amendment. I do not think that he would give a wrong interpretation in this case also.

An Hon. Member: His interpretation is correct.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): You may have your own interpretation.

Shri Dhulekar: Yes. There is clause 23.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If an institution calls itself *Vishwa Vidyalyaya* what will happen? It does not prohibit the use of its equivalents or synonyms in the regional languages.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): *Vishwa Vidyalyaya* would include all the universities of the world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A university is called like that.

Shri Dhulekar: With regard to clause 23 also. I approached the hon. Minister in writing. There are three institutions in India which have got the word 'university' after their names: Jhansi Ayurvedic University, Gurukul University and the Brindaban University. All these institutions are recognised by the U.P. Government and also by the Government of India. They are receiving grants; in the official Gazette the words 'Gurukul University' appear; 'Brindaban University' appear. In the Official Gazette Jhansi Ayurvedic University also appear. In the Delhi Gazette also degrees awarded by Jhansi Ayurvedic University are recognised. So, these three institutions are having the word 'university' against their names. So, when this clause was put in saying that no institution shall be entitled to have the word 'University' associated with its name in any manner whatsoever, I approached the hon. Minister and the Education Ministry said that there is a proviso added to this clause which says:

“Provided that nothing in this section shall, for a period of two years from the commencement of this Act, apply to an institution which, immediately before such commencement, had the word ‘University’ associated with its name.”

That is, two years have been given for these institutions to get themselves declared as universities either by getting a legislation passed in the State or in the Central legislature or getting their names declared as universities under clause 3 of this Act.

My learned friend the Deputy Minister disagrees and he again puts a wrong interpretation upon this clause 23. He says that even if a declaration is made by the Central Government by a notification under clause 23 declaring certain institutions to be universities still the institutions will not be able to use the word ‘University’ along with their names.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid, under clause 3 this University cannot be recognised.

Shri Dhulekar: Here is clause 3 it is said:

“The Central Government may, on the advice of the Commission, declare, by notification in the Official Gazette, that any institution for higher education, other than a University shall be deemed to be a University for the purposes of this Act, and on such a declaration being made, all the provisions of this Act shall apply to such institution as if it were a University within the meaning of clause (f) of section 2.”

My interpretation is this, that when the members of these three universities approached the Education Ministry saying that the prohibition of the word ‘University’ will cause them difficulty the Education Ministry granted two years so that they may get either a declaration under clause 3....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. My interpretation is – of course, subject to Shri Chatterjee’s – that section 3 does not help the universities so far as the name is concerned. This cannot be called a university at the end of two years even if it is registered as such.

Shri Dhulekar: My submission is this. I was on the Joint Committee from the beginning to the end and I would say....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member’s language has to be interpreted by the House and not by the Joint Committee only.

Shri Dhulekar: My submission is that two years have been given for converting these institutions themselves into properly incorporated or declared institutions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Declaration under clause 3 – I do not want to take the time of the House – is useless. It will not save the situation. It will not enable the hon. Member to call his erstwhile University a University.

Shri Dhulekar: I am submitting. Sir, that this saving clause was put in with the intention that these institutions may take either of the two courses: (i) either they may apply to the Commission that they may apply to the Commission that they may be declared 'Universities' or (ii)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is useless. Even if the Commission declares the hon. member's University as a 'University' the hon. Member cannot have the name 'University' attached to the name of the institution. He will have to delete it at the end of two years.

Shri Dhulekar: So, I say that the very object of this saving clause will be defeated. Therefore, I have put in an amendment before you that just as in clause 22 where the words are:

“The right of conferring or granting degrees shall be exercised only by a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act or an institution deemed to be a University under section 3. . . .”

The wording of this clause must also be changed. My amendment seeks to change clause 23 like this:

“No institution, whether a corporate body or not, other than a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act or an institution deemed to be University under section 3. . . .”

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, the hon. Member has taken more than 20 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I took some three minutes out of that.

Shri Dhulekar: I have placed this amendment before you for the approval of the House so that the meaning may be very clear. I do not wish that the provisions of the Act should be circumvented or evaded in any way. The Commission has to be approached at any stage and the Central Government has to be approached at every stage. Therefore,

when the Commission and the Central Government both have decided that a particular institution should be a University then there should be no difficulty if under section 3 a notification is issued and a declaration made.

I have placed these points before the House so that the Members may see that when there is a provision that such of the institutions in the country as are national institutions may be declared as 'Universities' that provision is not such that it may become ineffective.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Achuthan.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I would like to point out that though it is not yet lunch time there is not enough quorum in the House. It seems to have become the fashion of the day.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am glad the hon. Member is here.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I am always here, Sir.

Shri K.K. Basu: At least when he raises such points before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought the hon. Member will give a couplet. Now, let us proceed.

Shri Achuthan: I welcome this measure. Even though the Radhakrishnan Commission reported years back and the Government was trying its best to see that a measure of this nature is brought into existence, at least we have the consolation that this measure in its present form is now before us. Some hon. Members expressed the view that the subject of education ought to be the concern of the Centre alone. But, under the Constitution, if we look to the Schedule, we will see that education is a matter purely concerning the States. Moreover, in the State itself, in order to give autonomy to the University, the State Government does not take up directly the question of higher university education. There are special enactments in the States concerned by which the universities in the respective States are given almost complete autonomy. The State gives them grants and if at all any suggestions come up before them for amending the University Act, then the State Governments say: "These are our views" and then enacts the measure. So, according to me, apart from the Centre and the States concerned, now we are going to have the University Grants Commission for the purpose of promoting higher education in this country.

Many Members expressed the view that the powers of the University Grants Commission must be enlarged. I have my own views in the matter. I do not agree with them. According to me the universities are

more competent; as they are now under the Constitution, to see that their curriculam or their programme is decided in the best way, than the University Grants Commission. The Commission is only a supervising body which is meant more for the promotion of research work, standardisation work and for giving grants to those universities and other institutions recognised under section 3 where it is highly necessary to give such grants in the national interest. So, there is not much to say with regard to the composition of this University Grants Commission or to give more powers to this body other than what is now given to the Universities in the respective universities Acts of those States.

Many Members also expressed the view that this Commission must give special attention to the rural universities. According to me, even though there may be two dozens of universities and a few hundreds of colleges, many colleges are filled by students coming from rural areas. Take, for example, my State of Travancore-Cochin. There are more than 45 colleges there. They come under two universities, Madras and Travancore. If you take a census of all those students studying in those colleges, you will see that more than 90 per cent. of them are from rural areas. They may belong to the middle-class or the lower middle-class. If you want rural universities to be opened it is the concern of the universities of the respective States concerned to see that all subject are taught in such rural universities and decide upon their location, etc. Take for instance, Bombay. I have read from the newspapers that in Bombay they have opened a rural university College where subjects which are peculiar to the rural areas of that part of the country were included in the curriculum and instruction is imparted in those subjects. I can understand that. But what is the meaning in saying that the University Grants Commission must take up the question of rural universities throughout India. I do not agree with that view.

Then the question of language was taken up yesterday by many hon. Members. I feel it very difficult to agree with those Members who stated that the university education must be in regional languages. I understand that the regional languages must develop. They must flourish. They must have their own vocabulary enriched more and more. I understand that provincial languages must be considered on a national scale. But one difficulty may arise. The subjects of study in Madras, Andhra and Travancore Universities may then be in Tamil, Telugu and Malayalam respectively. If education in all the subjects is imparted in the regional languages at the university standard, where is the scope for students from other areas to go to a college falling under

an area different from theirs and study there? It would result in regimentation. If colleges in particular areas teach the subjects in the particular language, the regional language, of that area, how can students from other areas join such colleges? Suppose, the students studying in the Travancore University study everything in Malayalam, how can they go to Madras and join a college there where the medium of instruction would be Tamil? If this is the case, after a few years, especially after the S.R.C. Report is implemented, there will come a stage when you will find that, in some colleges at least, only students belonging to that particular area study in those colleges. What I want is an interchange or intermingling of students, so to say, and an all-India outlook must be achieved. We are always crying from the housetops that we must have a national outlook. Even the division of the country on the basis of language, I should say, is an absurd proposition. Of course, this is not the occasion to speak on that subject. If you take up the question of language being given undue influence in respect of higher education, it would not be good. I can understand that in the case of primary education or secondary education and there is the end of the matter there. For higher education, you must evolve a scheme by which students from any part of the country, irrespective of the provincial or regional language of the area from which they come, must be able to study in a college. For instance, suppose Calcutta is having perhaps the best colleges in the country. How can we, from Travancore-Cochin, go there if they teach only in Bengali? How can our students go over there for intermediate or B.A. or M.A. or M.Sc.? The instruction in these classes will be available there only in the medium of Bengali. In the natural course you will see that there is a division. If you say Bengali alone, I will say Malayalam alone or Tamil alone.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: Then, what language does he suggest so as to be introduced in the colleges, in order that students from one State may go to another State?

Shri Achuthan: I say English or Hindi or Sanskrit. There must be some language which is common throughout India. Even now, only because of the English language, we mingle together. Otherwise, how can all of us speak and understand in this Parliament? Therefore, this question must be seriously considered by able men, able educationists and particularly you, Sir. No one area should be handicapped in this respect, because, after a few years, the position will be Malayalam for Malayalees. They will be confined to that area alone so that other universities teaching in their respective languages may not be able to

impart education to the students or Indian nationals who belong to other areas of the country.

Then there is another aspect. There are university colleges and affiliated colleges. In my State, for example, out of the 46 or 50 colleges, only four or five are government colleges. All other colleges are private and are affiliated to the university. Again, Christians have their own colleges; Nayars have their own colleges; Ezhavas have their own colleges; Muslims have their own colleges. There is competition going on. Every year, applications for opening colleges are pouring in. If, in one year, any particular community gives an application for opening a college, the next year all other communities also give applications for opening colleges. This campaign goes on there. The colleges of course satisfy the minimum requirements and they are growing like mushrooms. That is the problem. Even though we have colleges in good numbers, a time comes when the standard becomes low. Only in some colleges maintained by the Government, we get professors, the best equipment, the best library arrangements, etc. Other colleges are just an excuse and they run, ever trying to keep up the standard. So the University Grants Commission, even though their powers are limited, must see that in all colleges the standards are kept up. Even during admission, you must see that all students need not be admitted. The best, who are most efficient students, whose progress can be seen from their progress report and examination marks need alone be admitted so that higher education is meant really for those who are fit for it, and not for higher education's sake, not for seeing that the students just study and after a few years obtain a degree by passing from one class to another.

I generally agree with the provisions of the Bill. I agree to the appointment of a Commission. But I find in clause 6 that one-half of the members appointed for the first time shall retire on the expiration of the third year. I do not find any necessity, especially during the initial stages of the Commission, for one-half retiring. We are just establishing a University Grants Commission; it must function at least for ten or 15 years, and let it work up a system. There is no point in a member being appointed and retiring at the expiration of just three years, when the whole work is yet to start. Therefore, the system of one-half retiring is not, in my opinion, worthwhile at this stage. For at least ten or 15 years, you must not have that system of one-half retirement.

I agree with the powers and functions of the Commission. I have not much to say on that subject.

Then there is the question of election. I am not in favour of election in colleges and educational institutions. As was remarked by Shri

T.S.A. Chettiar who has had a vast experience in educational matters – he was also the Minister for Education in the Madras State – elections lead to very unpleasant consequences. The subject of education must be, so to say devoid of politics and other matters of faction. It must be kept aloof from them. Let us see that the best men are nominated and not elected, from among the Vice-Chancellors who are competent and respected by all people. It should not be said that this man stood for election and lost and that man stood for election and won. Such a thing in the educational field becomes, so to say, a reproach, and gives a feeling of detestation to my mind. It is detesting when you say that eminent men who are striving for nobler purposes are brought into the field of elections. So, I agree to the principle of nomination in this body.

The point made by the hon. Member who preceded me must be made clear, and that is in regard to the degrees conferred by certain bodies in this country. There are a number of institutions in the country which should be recognised for the conferment of degrees on students. Those institutions confer valuable degrees. It is not that all of those institutions came up in the last few years. They have their own background and tradition, and they do real service to the country in the field of education and there should not be any difficulty in their being brought into the fold of universities and awarding degrees to people who are qualified. There should not be any discouragement to those who are studying in such institutions, and such institutions should crop up in all parts of the country. Reference was made to certain institutions. We are proud of them. You were also referring to the Sanskrit Sammelan at Tirupathi. There are quite a number of such institutions, in my States also, but only step-motherly attitude is shown to them. It must not be so. As our revered President has remarked the other day, those institutions contain a lot of gems – especially those teaching Sanskrit – which we have not seen and the people claim that our forefathers were the writers of those valuable things. So, those institutions must be revered and we must see that the standards are kept up and given encouragement and that the national character is maintained.

My friend Shri Sharma was referring to the national purposes. Clause 20(1) says:

“In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions or questions of policy relating to national purposes as may be given to it by the Central Government.”

I am unable to understand clearly what is meant by “national purpose”; he was referring to research and all that; education is meant for that. But my difficulty is, if we use the term “national purpose” it may turn out to be something political. I do not know why that term has been used.

I support the Bill and say that the Bill must be passed and implemented, so that the aim may be achieved.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: I hope all sections of the House are agreed that university autonomy is essential for democracy in education. But, Sir, we ought to see at the same time that the agencies set up for education planning is really democratically constituted. I am afraid there we are disappointed. I wish the hon. Education Minister, Maulana Saheb, had been here. This is a very important Bill and I would have liked from the Education Minister, who is a Member of the Cabinet, some definite assurances. Otherwise, the House is not satisfied and there would be misgivings in the country. Of course, the hon. Deputy Minister and the able Parliamentary Secretary are here, but they are not Members of the Cabinet. This is a matter which requires tackling at the highest level. Therefore, I am sorry that during the five hours' debate yesterday and even today, the Education Minister is conspicuous by his absence.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): I may inform the hon. Member that the tackling at the highest level has already been done.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: I congratulate the Parliamentary Secretary on his loyalty to the Minister. But what I am pointing out is this. The Parliamentary Secretary has been good enough to give us the assurance. I am quoting his language:

“Protagonists of university autonomy will be happy to find that the Select Committee has given full guarantee of academic independence and autonomy to our universities. There should, therefore, be no longer any fear of violation of university autonomy.”

We are not satisfied with this statment of the Parliamentary Secretary. I am not doubting his *bona fides*. But I am saying that the composition of this University Grants Commission is such that it may easily degenerate into a limb of the Government and may become a mere department of the bureaucracy. What is this Commission? If you analyse the composition, you find that there will be 9 members of which

not less than three members will be from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities; two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government and the remaining number from among persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinction. But there is a proviso:

“Provided that not less than one-half of the number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government” etc.

Out of the nine, one member will be a whole-time member, namely, the Chairman and there will be four Government officers. That means out of 9, 5 will be practically Government officials. We are therefore pleading that there should be introduction of greater elective element, non-official element and there should not be any over-emphasis of officialdom in this Commission, if it is to inspire confidence.

There are certain points raised very pointedly by some hon. Members in their note of dissent. If you look at clause 14, you will find the penalty clause. It says:

“If any university fails within a reasonable time to comply with any recommendation made by the Commission under section 12 or section 13, the Commission, after taking into consideration the cause, if any, shown by the University for its failure to comply with such recommendation, may withhold from the University the grants proposed to be made out of the Fund of the Commission.”

That means penalising any university for not carrying out the order or directives of the Commission. A Member from South India has raised a point. Supposing the Commission in its wisdom says that some South Indian University must carry on its teaching in Hindi and if it fails to do so within the time-limit prescribed, then will that penalty be incurred? I am strongly in favour of having a national language and Hindi should be made *lingua franca* as soon as possible. I was touring South India this year and I had been to Tirupati and also to other centres of university learning; but I was amazed to find that there was a lot of dissatisfaction and misgiving amongst our friends in South India. One hon. Member from the South is saying in his minute of dissent:

“In order to clear the misunderstanding of our people in the South, it should be made clear in the Bill itself in some

form that in the name of national purpose or co-ordination, determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, the Commission should have no power to change the teaching language of the university. It should have every right to examine academic standards obtaining in such universities and in controlling expenditure” etc.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary said that these things have been tackled at a very high level. May I know whether this point was tackled at that level and if so is the hon. Minister, his Deputy or the Parliamentary Secretary in a position to give an assurance that this will not be utilised for any such purposes?

Dr. M.M. Das: Yes; we will give.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: I am very happy to know it; but, with due respect to my learned friend, I say that an assurance from the Cabinet Minister, a Minister of the rank and standing of Maulana Saheb, would have been very welcome and very desirable.

There is one other thing, and that is about clause 20. One hon. Member was just now asking, “What is this national purpose?” Clause 20 reads as follows:

“In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy relating to national purposes as may be given to it by the Central Government.”

This is an ambiguous phrase and the Commission may be utilised for a purpose even beyond what is really and strictly a national purpose. My hon. friend was saying yesterday that “national purpose means whatever purpose Government thinks best”. Therefore, Governmental purpose is synonymous with national purpose. That is a very very narrow bureaucratic approach. (*Interruptions.*)

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Right, right.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: Sir, there is this danger. Sub-clause (2) of clause 20 says:

“(2) If any dispute arises between the Central Government and the Commission as to whether a question is or is not a question of policy relating to national purposes, the decision of the Central Government shall be final.”

This is really something which requires clarification. I wanted to press the Education Minister to give us an indication as to what was in

his mind and what is the educational policy of the Government going to be, so that we may know where we stand. I am strongly in favour of maintaining the autonomy of universities. We have no right, this Parliament, however much may be its strength and sovereignty, has no right to encroach upon the freedom and autonomy not merely of the universities, but also of the States concerned. The Calcutta University is functioning under the Universities Act; its academic standards and rules and regulations are prescribed by that Act and by the statutes which created the Syndicate, the Senate and the Academic Council. They are to determine and to say what the standards of university education should be. Therefore, when we say we are setting up this Commission in order to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards of universities, and for that purpose establishing this University Grants Commission, I doubt and I am apprehensive of a double dose of attack on the autonomy of both the Universities and the States. What right has the University Grants Commission, ordinarily, to determine standards? The standards have got to be prescribed by the Academic Council by the Senate of the University. If there is anything wrong, the State is there. You know, Sir, that in our Constitution there is a deliberate division of legislative powers and legislative functions. In its wisdom, the Constituent Assembly has prescribed that University education shall be a State subject, an exclusively State subject. Only in respect of technical and vocational education, we have reserved it to Parliament. Therefore, Parliament can legitimately set standards.....

Dr. M.M. Das : The hon. Member forgets to mention item 66 of the Union list in which this responsibility of maintenance and co-ordination of standards has been deliberately placed on the shoulders of the Central Government.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: I am not saying that the Bill is *ultra vires*. I hope my learned friend will give me the credit of knowing this. If it had infringed or gone beyond the circumscribed limits of that provision, it would have been *ultra vires* and I would have taken the point that this Parliament is not competent to legislate. I am not saying that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is trying to establish what the scope of co-ordination is.

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He does not say that the House has no right or this Parliament has no right to co-ordinate. But, what is that co-ordination?

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: I am not raising the point that this is *ultra vires*. I am not questioning the powers and authority of this Parliament. I am saying, assuming it is *intra vires*, what is this you are doing? Is there not the danger of trespassing on the jurisdiction and autonomy of the University and the academic set-up which has been constituted under the University Act? Are you not to some extent also likely to trespass upon the jurisdiction and authority of the State Governments? We have got the Calcutta University Act. We have got the Senate, the Syndicate and the Post-graduate Council, and the Academic Council, which set the standards, maintain the standards, determine the standards and co-ordinate the standards to some extent. We want to know what exactly is the intention. How will you, in practice, operate, so that there should be no overlapping, so that there should be no trespass or encroachment or, in any way, deflection of the rightful authority of the University? If there is any trouble, in Calcutta, Dr. Roy's administration of West Bengal would look into that. If there is anything wrong in the Tirupathi University or the Andhra University, the Andhra Government will look into that and the Andhra State will look into it.

There is one clause which has been put in by the Joint Committee which I do not like to be there. I am drawing your attention to page 4 of the Joint Committee report where it is said:

“The Committee consider that the University Grants Commission should have power to deal not only with constituent colleges but also other colleges affiliated to the University.”

I know, Shri H.N. Mukerjee has commended it to the acceptance of the House. I am asking this Parliament very seriously to consider whether you should accept it. What is this power that you are giving to this Commission? You are giving power to the Commission not merely to deal with Universities, but to deal directly with affiliated colleges. I am afraid you are going too far. You are really embarking upon dangerous ground which will lead to undesirable consequences. In page 2, clause 2 (f) says:

“‘University’ means a University established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act....”

I have no objection to that. It proceeds:

“.....and includes any such institution as may, on the recommendation of the University concerned, be recognised

by the Commission in accordance with the regulations made in this behalf under this Act."

Therefore, you are giving power not merely to deal with the Universities, but to deal directly with affiliated colleges. I am submitting that that would not be right. The wording is, "institution as may, on the recommendation of the University concerned, be recognised by the Commission". We all know that he who pays the piper may call for the tune. Therefore, in the garb of giving out doles and stimulating research the Universities will be, to a large extent, at the mercy of this Commission. Supposing the Commission wants that a particular institution or college should be recognised by the Commission, I take it, ordinarily, the University will not be able to stand in the way. What happens? The Commission does not deal with the University; it deals with the institution directly. I submit that that is not proper. That may lead to all sorts of anomalies and undesirable situations. It may, to a large extent, detract from the autonomy of the Universities and also make these institutions come directly under the thumb of the Government. I submit that this kind of thing should not be allowed.

I am strongly supporting the recommendation made by Shri Meghnad Saha and other Members for stimulating rural education. There is a lot of criticism nowadays that our youth are going astray. Undesirable incidents are taking place in big cities. It happened only the other day in Bombay, and yesterday in Rewa and other places. They say that the youth are going astray and that the educationists are not doing their duty, and also that the Universities have not been able to control and mould the youth of the country during the critical period of adolescence. To a large extent it is correct that the teachers.....

Dr. M.M. Das: May I have the benefit of the opinion of my learned friend about the amendment of Shri Meghnad Saha?

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: Shri Meghnad Saha's amendment is two-fold. First, he says:

"The Commission shall consist of—

(a) an executive body of seven members consisting of a whole-time Chairman and four other whole-time experts respectively on Arts, Sciences, Engineering and Technology and Medicine and two secretaries of the Ministry of Education and Finance....."

I wholeheartedly commend this to the acceptance of this House. I think that is very desirable. Shri Meghnad Saha has made out a very

good case. He is an educationist of great standing. He occupies a Chair of the Calcutta University. He has held other Chairs. He is one of the world-famous scientists. He has also assured me that the onerous responsibility which has been entrusted to this Commission cannot be really discharged unless you have more than one whole-time expert. I know there is a lot of comment on the Law Commission because there are not more whole-time men. I also commend to the acceptance of the hon. Minister our suggestion that you cannot get any desirable results unless you have more than one whole-time man. You cannot have only one man for the purpose of tackling this problem of 35 Universities, co-ordinating standards, promoting research, stimulating industrial education and also technical education and also stimulating education in scientific and technological subjects which have not been explored even today. I wholeheartedly approve of this recommendation of Shri Meghnad Saha and I hope that the hon. Deputy Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary will sympathetically consider that.

With regard to the Advisory Council, I have my doubts whether that would be not leading to duplication and overlapping. With regard to the first part of Shri Meghnad Saha's suggestion, I thoroughly agree.

What I was pointing out was this. Unless you remove the Universities from the deleterious influences of big urban centres where there are so many cinema houses, opera halls, dancing places, *Bharata Natyam* and other things, you cannot possibly have that atmosphere where education can be imparted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Will there not be a touring cinema close by?

Shri N.C. Chatterjee: When Dr. Katju was the Governor of Bengal, you know, he was the Chancellor of the Calcutta University. He appointed me as the Chairman of the Commission to reorganise commerce studies in the Calcutta University. You will be amazed to know that there are 14,000 commerce students in the Calcutta University, – I am not saying under the Calcutta University, but in the Calcutta colleges and when I went to inspect along with the members of my Commission some of the Calcutta commerce colleges I found that in a particular college – Shri Mukerjee knows it very well – there were 4,500 students and there was not sitting accommodation even for 2,000. I do not know where the rest of the 2,500 students were studying. There were shifts.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Two-shift classes.

Shri N.C.Chatterjee: Three shifts.

When I went to the University of Birmingham, – the greatest commerce university in England today is Birmingham – the Vice-Chancellor and the Professor of Commerce and the Dean of the Faculty of Commerce, all of them came and I had the privilege of discussing matters with them, and they were telling me: “Why don’t you introduce this system which we have introduced in Birmingham?” I asked them: “What is the wonderful thing you have introduced?” They said – I was then a Judge of the Calcutta High Court – “ Mr. Justice Chatterjee, we do not give any student in Birmingham a B.Com. degree unless and until he goes into a slum area or factory and actually is with the labourers or with the particular industrial concern for at least three months and then he submits a thesis. Why don’t you do it?” I laughed and laughed. They asked me: “Why are you laughing?” I said: “We have got 14,500 students. Where are the slums or factories to send them to?” They thought I was joking. They never knew that this was feasible or possible.

When I went to the University of Paris – I do not know whether any of my friends have been there – I found that they had developed it even more. One year out of three years every student must spend in the slums or in the factory along with a professor attached to a group of boys.

That kind of education we want, not this kind of mass production, this regimentation, this standardisation, this kind of unsatisfactory diplomas being given and at the same time, to some extent telling the boys that they have been given this *imprimatur* which has got no market value and which gives them false hopes and false expectations. They are very often disappointed because nothing happens and they are not fit really for the struggle of life.

I am strongly advocating rural education. In the Calcutta University, there is a college started by the Ramakrishna Mission at Belur. Belur is just a few miles away, but they are practically every year standing first or second or high up in university examinations, because to some extent they are removed from the unfavourable atmosphere of a big city like Calcutta. In that spiritual atmosphere of Shri Ramakrishna’s great mission they are doing very good work. Not only that. They are able to build up character which is much more important than merely academic degrees or diplomas. I am strongly supporting that, and I am also strongly supporting the proposition – the hon. Ministers will also help us – that there should be really some Sanskrit Universities started. I am strongly supporting the suggestion made by a lady Member yesterday

that there should be a Sanskrit University started at Nabadwip. That is a sacred spot which was the birth place of Shri Chaitanya. After Taxila and Nalanda that was the greatest university, and for at least 500 years it was a university of international repute. I want your Tirupati should have a first class Sanskrit University. The States Reorganisation Commission has recommended that there should be a Hindi University in Hyderabad. Of course, I am glad that Hyderabad State is going to be liquidated, but still there will be Hyderabad city and I hope something will be done to build a real first-class university devoted to Hindi in the South, if possible in Hyderabad.

The time has come when there must be a thoroughly new outlook. Do not think of the humanities or arts and sciences and simply carry on duplication or triplication of ordinary colleges with stereotyped formulae and stereotyped syllabus and the old type of teaching. I want that India should be now made fit, that our boys now should be made fit for new responsibilities. What is this colossal unemployment? Dr. B.C. Roy has stated in the Bengal Legislative Assembly that out of every one hundred employed, there are fortyseven unemployed in the city of Calcutta or in the industrial area round about. That is, there are lakhs and lakhs of boys, unemployed although decently educated. He was talking of the Bhadralog or the middle class educated people. I do not know, it may be even more. Therefore, in the city of Calcutta there are at least half a million educated boys who cannot get employment and are starving. Something should be done to tackle this problem. Otherwise, it is no good simply giving them B.A. and M.A., B.Com. and M.Com. degrees, turning them out in thousands just as the Britishers used to do for the purpose of manufacturing clerks to run efficiently and cheaply the out-moded colonial form of administration for their own purpose. The time has come when we must see that this kind of colossal unemployment is weeded out and they are given technological and practical training which can equip them for the struggle of life.

Speech delivered by Pt. T.D. Bhargava in Hindi¹

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Babu Ramnarayan Singh.

Shri Veeraswamy: I have been trying to catch your eye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is the older of the two.

Certain suggestions made by Babu Ramnaryan Singh.

1. Pandit Thakar Das Bhargava, Member of Lok Sabha from Gurgaon (Punjab).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I call upon Shri Veeraswamy and after him I will call upon Shri Gopala Rao.

Shri Veeraswamy (Myuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): To catch the eye of the Chair has become a problem with me.

Shri H.G. Vaishnav (Ambad.): What about the chance for this side, Sir?

Dr. Deputy-Speaker: The position is this. Dr. Suresh Chandra raised this point earlier and I have been looking on this side and on that side, but it is only Shri Vaishnav that gets up now on this side. If no one gets up on one side, what can I do?

Shri Veeraswamy: Though to catch the eye of the Chair is very difficult, somehow I succeeded in catching the eye of the Chair because of my constant attempt.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The complaint is that the Opposition catches my eye more often than this side.

Shri Veeraswamy: It is also because of the sympathy of the Chair towards Members like me. I am here not to welcome this measure but to oppose it and I register my strong protest against it on behalf of the South Indians, more especially on behalf of the Tamilians.

An Hon. Member: Including the Chair.

Shri Veeraswamy: This measure has been opposed by most of the Vice-Chancellors of the Indian Universities.

Dr. M.M. Das: That is wrong; the hon.Member is giving wrong information to the House.

Shri Veeraswamy: There may be some who welcome this measure, but the educational experts of this country have registered their protest against this measure because it is going to control the autonomous University bodies existing now in the States through the University Grants Commission. It is really surprising to me that the party in power and the Government appear to be interested in higher education and in the improvement of the standard of education of the universities. It is a well-known fact that the party in power has aroused a great contempt and hatred for English, that beautiful and excellent language which has elevated us to such an extent as to be a great nation in the world today within a short span of time. Since independence we have been able to make ourselves felt in the comity of nations not because of Hindi but because of English. This measure is an attempt, it is vividly clear to me, to dominate over the regional languages by Hindi.

Pandit K.C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): You can put up with English but not with Hindi.

Shri Veeraswamy: The University Commission is going to make grants to universities and compel them to introduce Hindi, in course of time, as the medium of instruction in place of English or the regional language.

Dr. M.M. Das: Is that written in the Bill?

Shri Veeraswamy: It is not written in the Bill that the Commission will recommend to any university the measures necessary for the improvement of university education and advise the university upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation. There are two more clauses. Clause 20 says:

“In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy relating to national purposes as may be given to it by the Central Government.

If any dispute arises between the Central Government and the Commission as to whether a question is or is not a question of policy relating to national purposes, the decision of the Central Government shall be final.”

If wisdom prevails on the Commission not to compel any university to introduce Hindi as the medium of instruction, the decision of the Central Government will be final; that is, they can compel the Commission or the university to accept Hindi as the medium of instruction.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair* .]

Dr. M.M. Das: May I make a categorical statement that the Government of India has not the slightest intention of making the medium of instruction in our universities a subject of policy? I will deal with this in my speech later, but as the hon. Member has referred to that point now, I think it desirable that I should mention it now.

Shri Veeraswamy: I would suggest to the Government to provide specifically in this measure that Hindi will never be imposed on any university as the medium of instruction and that must find a place in this Bill so that we the people of Tamil Nad may be free from the fear of the domination of the North over the South.

Shri V.P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): What does the Parliamentary Secretary say to this?

Shri Veeraswamy: Every hon. Member coming from the South knows very well that the standard of education both in high schools and

colleges there was and is the highest in this country, and so also the standard of education of the Bengal University is very high. But I can say without any hesitation that when you compare the present standard of education in our schools and colleges with the standard of education during the British day, it is far below and this is because of the contempt and hatred being aroused among the students towards English. Now the affection for English is decreasing and people are being told that English is not going to be in India and it will never occupy a place of honour in India and it is Hindi that will become the national and official language. So the students think that English is not going to help them and that it is Hindi that will help them. It is this thought that is being developed in the minds of students. If the Government are really interested if they shed real tears over the deteriorating standard of education in our universities, and if the tears are not crocodile tears, I would suggest to the Government to give up their madness for Hindi, aversion towards English and not to interfere with the autonomous bodies, that is, universities in their administration. Leave the universities as they are, allow them to work as they like to do in the future also.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): The hon. Member has taken his oath of allegiance to the Constitution but he is speaking against the Constitution.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West): May I rise on a point of order? Here is a very important Bill being discussed. Neither the Minister is here — he has never listened to any of the speeches on the Bill — nor the Deputy Minister is here. We here are speaking to empty benches and are going to take decisions. I think you should send for the Minister or the Deputy Minister.

Pandit K.C. Sharma: The Parliamentary Secretary is here.

Mr Chairman: This is not the first time when complaints of this nature have been made. Many Members have adverted to this subject and the Chair also has many times said on the floor of the House that ordinarily the Minister incharge or other Minister should be present when a discussion of an important nature takes place. At the same time the Chair has got no power to enforce the attendance of any particular Minister here. This is the difficulty. The Parliamentary Secretary is here, he represents the Department and he represents the Minister also, but at the same time it is quite desirable that when an important question like a Bill of this nature is discussed, the Minister incharge and other important Ministers should remain present in the House — The difficulty is that I am unable to enforce the attendance.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Unfortunately, it is only the exception that the hon. Minister incharge of the Bill is present; the rule is that they are absent.

Dr. M.M. Das: I may submit to you that the hon. Deputy Minister was here; he has gone out for taking his lunch like other Members. He will come back again within a few minutes.

Shri V.P. Nayar: You do not want lunch?

Mr. Chairman.: The complaint is not against the Deputy Minister who was here for such a long time. The real complaint is this. The hon. Minister incharge is not here. The Bill is extremely important as the hon. Member himself said. It is very desirable that the hon. Minister should listen to the speeches here and come to conclusions in respect of composition, etc., of this Commission. In his absence it is very difficult to impress only the Deputy Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary because the Minister incharge of this Bill is not here. It is he who really can influence the decision of the Cabinet also in this respect if necessary. It is a most important question and if he is not here it means that the Members are speaking almost to empty benches. It is not desirable.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: As the Bill is very important as you have yourself said, and as the Minister incharge of that Bill is not here, may I suggest that this Bill may be postponed until the Minister comes here. Otherwise what we say today here will be of no use. We are going to pass a measure which is going to affect the whole educational system of our country; it is not like Grants Commission in U.K. where it is only a disbursing commission.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue.

Shri Veeraswamy: This is an important point which I hope the Parliamentary Secretary will convey to the hon. Minister and ask him to be present here at least during the clause by clause discussion so that he will understand the spirit of discussion over this measure.

My hon. friend coming from Travancore-Cochin a few minutes ago wept over the conditions obtaining in our country and said that regional languages were going to become the media of instructions in all institutions. He regretted that for one reason that our students could not go and mix with other students because the medium of instruction will be the stumbling block to the students coming from other regions. With the interest of our country and of the coming generations very deep in my heart, I would suggest to the Government that English may

be the medium of instruction in the colleges because that is the only force which could bring together our people. Hindi is not going to be accepted by us Tamils – I am not joking – as the national language or the official language and so on behalf of the Tamils I suggest this for the good of the country to this august and supreme body of the nation that English may be retained as the medium of instruction in all our universities. Or I shall make a correction. It may be so in such of the universities which want to retain English as the medium of instruction. If the Government is very particular about pushing through this measure, I would like to suggest to the Parliament to make provision that the Commission will have no power, as I said first, to compel any university to introduce Hindi as the medium of instruction except in the Hindi speaking areas.

Mr. Chairman: Hon Member seems to be fighting a phantom. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has already given out the policy. After hearing that, I do not think it is necessary to talk more and more about this.

Shri Veeraswamy: Even then I have got my own doubts. That is why I stress this point.

The Radhakrishnan Commission has suggested the creation of regional university commissions. This Commission itself is going to be created according to the recommendations of that Radhakrishnan Commission. So, let there also be regional university commissions giving directions to the regional universities and this Grants Commission may confine its work only to sanction of grants to the universities, inspecting the universities and also getting facts and figures or information from the various universities and compiling a report so that other countries may come to know how our universities have been working and how our standard of education is improving. We may also get facts and figures from foreign universities and make it available to our regional universities.

The number of members on the Commission to be set up is nine. My hon. friend, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party has suggested that 17 members should be there on the Commission. I would like to suggest that more than half of the members should be representatives of universities so that their voice may be binding on the Commission. If others are allowed to dominate over the Commission, the decisions will not be in favour of the universities.

The office of the Chairman alone has been made a salaried one and not that of the members. It is better that the members are also made

salaried members so that they can give their best attention to the proper working of this Commission. It is said in this Bill that information collected from Indian universities and foreign ones will be made available to such of the universities which ask for such information. I would like to suggest that the information should be made available to all the universities irrespective of the fact whether they ask for such information or not. Are we – Members of Parliament – not provided with the entire proceedings of the House whether we know the three R's or not? So, every university should be provided with the information that would be collected from Indian as well as foreign universities.

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): Though substantial improvements have been made in the Bill in its present form, at the same time, at the very outset I would say that there are basic points, unless they are radically changed, there is no scope for achieving the main purpose of the bill. You know, in the recent past there has been a great awakening, enlightenment and desire in the country for higher education with the result that with the help and initiative of the enlightened public and the liberal contribution of the masses a good number of colleges, high schools and other educational institutions have come into being. But, in this effort, I am sorry to say, the Government could not rise to the occasion either to finance them or to get further advancement of their institutions. Even under the present Bill in its present form there are no provisions regarding the affiliated colleges and I have not been able to understand what is the policy taken by the Government regarding the question of affiliated colleges. One cannot think of developing our university education – promoting or consolidating it, whatever it may be – without solving the question of affiliated colleges. A number of problems are connected with the affiliated colleges. We all know that 80 per cent. of the university education is done through these colleges. Out of a total student population of 4 lakhs more than 3 lakhs are receiving education through these affiliated colleges. In the same way, take Andhra or any other State. Out of 35 colleges in Andhra 32 are affiliated colleges and one or two university colleges. Therefore, I say that our approach must be one and the same both towards university colleges and affiliated colleges. Some effort was made in the Joint Committee to improve this position but only those colleges will come within the purview of this Bill which are recommended by the university authorities and recognised by the University Grants Commission. I do not know to what extent this will cover the affiliated colleges. Also, nobody knows on what criteria the universities will recommend that

such and such colleges can be given grants. The present financial position of these colleges is very precarious and they are on no sound foundation. Unless the Central Government go to the rescue of these colleges it is very difficult to advance these colleges or even maintain them.

The argument advanced by the Government against bringing all the affiliated colleges under the purview of this Bill is simply that they are in a good number and there are no funds or the funds are limited. This cannot be a proper argument to defend their case because when 80 per cent. of the students are receiving education through these colleges and when we are here seeking to expand or develop our university education and are discussing the whole reorganisation of the university education we cannot ignore this problem. You can accept the general principle of bringing these affiliated colleges under the purview of this Bill and impose certain restrictions that a college with a standing of 10 years, or with a certain student population of, say, 1000, or with certain equipments and certain other standards will only be covered by this Bill. These restrictions can be imposed.

Coming to my second point, I am surprised to see that not a single word is there in this Bill about the staff on which we have to depend or the whole implementation of the Bill, whatever form it may take. For the implementation of the Bill we will have to depend upon the staff – the professors, lecturers and so on – of these institutions. The staff have to play a definite role in the development of our education. That being the case, how can we ignore them in this Bill. Only in clause 26 some mention is made regarding standards, classification of staff and something like that. But, if you see the present situation you will find that they are in a very bad condition. According to the information I have got out of 15000 college teachers, 6000 get below Rs. 150 per month, 7000 get below Rs. 250 per month and only about 1500 people are drawing more than Rs. 250. I know – this is within my personal knowledge – that very good writers, scholars, and poets who are working for the last 15 years – some Telugu pandits and other pandits – are not even drawing Rs. 250 a month. Unless these people who are expected to run the whole university education are well paid and their livelihood is properly assured, ultimately they will have to resort to some other ways to maintain their families. When they are in search of their livelihood they are forced to resort to some part-time professions also. How can you expect a teacher under such conditions to spend his time in studies, in doing research work so that he may learn new things to teach our

students? Therefore, what actually happens is, real education is not being done inside the colleges. These students who are not satisfied with the education inside the colleges are forced to go to private tutors paying them large sums of money. Of course, this can only be done by students who come from rich families. What about the students who come from poor families? They are helpless. They will not be able to get good education inside the colleges, nor will they be able to go to private tutors and get good education due to lack of money. Therefore, this question must also find a place somewhere in this Bill. When any step is taken in the direction of development of education the question of salary of the staff should not be ignored. That is why I say that at least all the recommendations of the University Education Commission regarding pay scales of university teachers should be applied to the affiliated colleges also.

The other point connected with this is that our colleges are understaffed. According to information I have got, in other countries 1:10 is the ratio between the teaching staff and the students whereas in our country – I do not know the exact figures – the ratio is 1:50 and in some places it is 1:70 or even 1:80. Unless some individual attention is paid, unless some individual instructions are given to the students it is not possible for students to have efficient education or for the teachers to give efficient and proper coaching to the students. These points must also be taken into consideration and provided for in some form or other in the Bill.

Another important point to which I want to refer is that in clause 20 a question of policy relating to national purpose has been put in. This clause is very beautifully vague. The whole world can come under the purview of this clause. Many of our friends raised all sorts of apprehensions and suspicions with regard to this. Under the plea of national purpose they can interfere in the day-to-day administration. Some friends are saying that under the plea of national purpose they can change the medium of instruction. It is also said that under the plea of national purpose they can take over some universities. As far as we are concerned for the last few years there is a wide rumour that the Central Government is thinking of taking over Osmania University as a Hindi University. We have no objection to Hindi being made the national language for central administration. But, with regard to the question of taking over the Osmania University for that purpose it will be strongly opposed and protested against by the 33 million people of Visal Andhra. It is better to make the point clear now itself. Let us put in

concrete, definite terms what is the meaning of 'national purpose'. It is not defined here and therefore, there is scope for every kind of apprehension and wrong interpretation.

According to clause 14 also the University Grants Commission can withhold grant proposed for a particular college or university under the plea that their recommendations are not being complied with by those institutions. This, I feel, is something like keeping some money within their hands and doing a sort of threatening. Some of our friends are very much afraid whether there will be provincial autonomy in future. This clause strengthens that apprehension. Therefore, I say that this clause must be redrafted in a different form. After a grant is given for a particular purpose, if the university or the college concerned consistently refuses to comply with the recommendations of the Commission even after so much persuasion, then the Grants Commission may take certain steps against that institution. In that way the whole clause must be redrafted.

Coming to the last point – money – I should like to say a few words. Last year only Rs. 1,20,00,000 or so was disbursed by the Grants Commission which is working now. The talks are colossal and very great and the funds are limited. If you want to fulfil the whole task that has been given in this Bill it would be very difficult unless the Commission had at its disposal some funds which may run to Rs. 10 crores or so. Otherwise, what is the purpose of giving so many powers and so many functions to the Commission? Development, promotion, consolidation and so many other things are there. For a Commission which has to deal with a Commission which has to deal with education in the whole country, unless sufficient funds are kept at its disposal, it is not possible to fulfil those colossal tasks assigned to the Commission. With these few words, I conclude.

Shri H.G. Vaishnav: The objects of this Bill are very commendable. They are, as mentioned in the Bill, "co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research in scientific and technical institutions" and also maintenance of standards of teaching and examinations in universities. But when we see the powers given to the Commission, I feel they are not adequate to fulfil this task. The Bill is named the University Grants Commissions Bill. From the name it appears that this Commission is nothing but a disbursing body. The task of the Commission seems to be just to find out the requirements of universities and recommend what grants should be given to the respective universities for the fulfilment of the purposes mentioned in

the Bill. But this is not the only object though apparently the name of the Bill indicates it to be so. If functions such as co-ordination and promotion of education, maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities, are to be discharged, really this Commission should have been given greater powers. The functions and powers are defined in clause 12 of the Bill. I think they are also inadequate, but, in spite of the powers being inadequate, whatever recommendations are made by the Commission should be acted upon. If the recommendations are not at all acted upon or complied with by the concerned universities, what is the remedy and how is the failure on the part of the universities to be dealt with? Clause 14 deals with such contingencies, but it only says:

“If any University fails within a reasonable time to comply with any recommendations made by the Commission under section 12 or section 13, the Commission, after taking into consideration the cause, if any, shown by the University for its failure to comply with such recommendations may withhold from the University the grants proposed to be made out of the Fund of the Commission.”

So withholding of the grant is the only consequence. My submission is that the universities which are already working, are working with their own funds. In view of the objectives before the Commission, if some scheme is proposed regarding co-ordination, promotion and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in the universities, and if that recommendation is not at all followed by the universities, what will happen? Whatever further grant which may be proposed by the Commission to that university may be withheld. My submission is that the universities which are not acting according to the recommendations of the Commission are not dependent on the grant given or proposed by this Commission, and if that point is disregarded by the concerned university, how are the recommendations regarding maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in the universities to be implemented? So, clause 14 is an obstacle in the way of executing the duties of the Commission. There ought to have been more powers for the Commission. In case the recommendations which are vital for the promotion and co-ordination of university education are not followed, certainly some other powers ought to have been given to the Commission to see that whatever they recommend in the interests of university

education and in the interest of the whole country is followed; if it is not followed, some other ways ought to have been shown so that the universities could be compelled to follow the directions given by the Commission.

Secondly, we see that this Commission is not at all entitled or authorised to have any of their own policies executed, or to formulate their own policies. If the Commission wants to put in a policy of their own, clause 20 will come in its way. Clause 20 says:

“..... the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy relating to national purposes as may be given to it by the Central Government.”

Such a Commission which serves a higher purpose ought to have been entrusted with some powers regarding policy, relating to national purpose or any other educational purpose. Of course, national purpose regarding universities can only be in respect of education and not of any other purpose. But that too is not given to the Commission. It is the Centre which is to guide the Commission under section 20. Then, my question is: what is the nature of this Commission. Is it only to disburse money after seeing the condition of the universities? If it is only disbursement of money, then that can be done even by some executive body. Some officers can be appointed; they can go round the whole country, visit the universities and just recommend the allotment of grants. If this is the only purpose, I think this Bill which aims at assuming higher levels, becomes useless. Therefore, the Commission ought to have been really empowered with many other powers than those mentioned in clause 12.

Then there is clause 13 which gives some powers of inspection. But is such a Commission to be given only powers of inspection? Again, if they find something wrong, they ought to have been given powers to correct that wrong by asking a particular university or body to take certain actions. In the absence of such powers, I think that the whole purpose, which though very high as I have said at the beginning, becomes rather useless and aimless.

Again, after reading the whole clause 12, from (a) to (i), it appears to me that this Commission is not at all empowered to establish any university or to recommend the establishment of any university at any place. Many hon. Members have said that there is a necessity for establishing rural universities, a Hindi University and so on. But in clause 12, from sub-clause (a) to sub-clause (i), no such power at all is

given to the Commission even to recommend the establishment of any university at any place. We are having a very big aim of the Bill but powers given to the Commission are only of inspection of universities, collection of information from universities and so on which in practice, will bring nothing. That seems to be the whole weakness of the Bill. Even while recommending grants, there is no mention about recommending grants to the universities for instituting free studentships, scholarships, stipends etc. to help poor students. We know that in our country hundreds of thousands of students are deprived of higher education because of their poverty. The universities concerned cannot pay proper attention and there are also things like favouritism and so on. This Commission can recommend grants for instituting free studentships and scholarships, but no such things has even been hinted in this Bill. The University Grants Commission is only to recommend grants to the universities according to their necessities. It has also not been made clear as to what the necessities are. Taking all this into consideration, I think that this Commission should be weaponed with proper authority. It would be given full authority really to have co-ordination as well as maintenance of standards of examination and so on. I hope these points will be taken into consideration by the concerned Ministry and suitable provisions will be made in the Bill.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore) : Mr. Chairman, the preamble of the UNESCO states that causes of war are born in the minds of men and in the minds of men deferences of peace should be constructed. Sir, after independence education has assumed a large proportion. Especially, university education has assumed great importance. Many hon. Members have spoken supporting the measures before the House, but, unfortunately, I have to take a different line of reasoning. Nobody has raised what I am rising just now. I shall presently place the point before the House. The same body, I feel should not be entrusted with a double task, namely, to deal with the question of giving grants to the universities; and bring about co-ordination and maintenance of standards in the university education. These two tasks, I submit, are very very serious and quite different. Each task demands undivided attention of a body of experts, and I feel the same body cannot deal with these two problems at the same time in an effective way. Even the Radhakrishnan Commission has said that the University Grants Commission should confine its activities to the matter of sanctioning grants; and the matter of fixing standards of university education and bringing about co-ordination and maintenance of standards should be entrusted to a separate body.

Dr. M.M. Das : That is a wrong information. I can quote from the University Education Commission's report. They have said that the two tasks should be given into the hands of one body.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : I will quote from the Radhakrishnan Commission's report.

An. Hon. Member : He has not seen that!

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : I am quoting from page 412 of the report:

"The initiative, in seeking advice, should always come from the universities. If the Commission proffered advice unsought, it would spoil the relationship we wish to see it established with the universities, which is the relation of friendship and not that of the policeman or even the inspector." My implication is this.

Dr. M.M. Das : It is only your implication.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : This sentence would show that unless the universities themselves want some advice from the Commission, the Commission should not tender advice to the universities. Thereby they have not supported the idea that the University Grants Commission should be entrusted with the responsibility of financing the universities as well as tendering advice to the universities in respect of educational matter. I feel that these are two different functions.

Dr. M.M. Das : For the information of the House, I will quote what the University Education Commission has said:

"The only solution is to give to the Universities Grants Commission that task of co-ordination with the sanctioning of grants."

This is the language of the Commission. I am speaking not by implication, but by quoting the language of the Commission.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : May I know in what page it is mentioned?

Dr. M.M. Das : I will give it later on.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : I have quoted from page 412 of the University Education Commission's report. Anyway, I do not want to join issue with the hon. Parliamentary Secretary on this point. I feel strongly that these two functions are very important and the same body cannot fulfil these two functions at the same time. Co-ordination and

maintenance of University standards should be entrusted or left in the hands of the Universities themselves, I am not sure whether taking power from the Universities and giving that power to the Central authority would enable us to maintain University standards or would help us in this task. I am seeing a great tribe of Education Ministers in our country, their performance and their equipment. By looking at them, one would think that these Education Ministers, are not competent or well equipped to deal with education matters. They have been given to the Education portfolio, not because they are competent or well equipped to deal with education matters, but because they must be given some portfolio. The Education Ministers are not experts in Education. This is the cause of our bane.

Shri K.K. Basu: The Ministers do not even know the subjects for which they are appointed.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: We cannot entrust the decision of policies in respect of education.....

Shri D.C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I do not know what the implications of the remarks of the hon. Member are:

Dr. Suresh Chandra : The hon. Member should not make such observations.

Mr. Chairman : Order, order. The hon. Member is on his legs and he is not giving way. He wants to know the implications which he has not understood. If the hon. Member gives way, he can interrupt and put a question.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: There were no implications. My remarks were very frank and I think they have been understood by all Members.

Shri K.K. Basu : You are only wasting Shri D.C. Sharma's time. You are not a qualified educationist.

Mr. Chairman : Order, Order.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: The University Grants Commission should only deal with the question of grants and it should not be burdened with the task of co-ordination or maintenance of standards and standardisation of University education. That is a task that should be entrusted to different body. The Radhakrishnan Commission says that while dealing with these questions, the University Grants Commission may gain knowledge and experience in education matters. While inspecting the Universities, while going round the Universities and educational institutions, the members of the Commission would certainly

collect a lot of materials and would gain knowledge and experience in matters of education. Certainly that knowledge should be availed of. They have therefore suggested that that knowledge and experience should be given to the Universities only when they are asked to give that knowledge and experience: not otherwise. I would suggest that there may be a different body. That knowledge and material of the Commission may be passed on to that body. That separate body may be entrusted with the task of fixing the standards, maintenance of standards and co-ordination of the University education. Here, unfortunately, both these functions have been entrusted to the same body. In a matter like this, the Government should not interfere too much with the autonomy of the Universities.

An Hon. Member: Should not interfere at all.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: I do not go to that extent. But, I would say that there should be less of interference on the part of the Government in respect of University affairs. Unfortunately, nowadays, especially after independence, too much of politics has entered the portals of the Universities, because, the Ministers themselves create groups and cliques within the portals of the Universities. I know, and I think it is common knowledge that in the University Councils Members are appointed because they belong to a particular party, or still less they belong to a certain community or still less, they are his personal friends and relatives. That is the consideration on which Members are appointed to the various University bodies everywhere and they are the people who decide the policy and standards of that particular University. The Ministers take direct interest in the appointment of these people. Believe me or not when I say that even the success or failure of a candidate is influenced by the Minister, through the Member who is in the University Council. Members of the University Council select examiners. Selection of an examiner is made because a Member of the University Council wants him to be selected. Everything today in the Universities is manoeuvred and managed by the Members of the University Council and these Members of the University Council are in one way or another subject to the pressure and influence of the Ministers. The passing of a candidate or the merit of a candidate depends upon the pressure brought on the examiners. That is why the standard of education in the University has gone down. It is impossible to raise the standard of education by giving powers to the Grants Commission. Unless you reform the whole thing and clean up the whole thing from the bottom, unless the manner of appointment to the

University Council and the various academic bodies is changed, unless the Universities are left to themselves, unless autonomy is restored to the Universities, unless there is less of interference on the part of the Government in University affairs, I do not think the University Grants Commission would be able to bring about a high standard of education in the Universities. I am certain that it will fail because the University Grants Commission may also become another instrument of interference in the affairs of the Universities. I feel strongly that the task of the University Grants Commission should be only distribution of funds and nothing else.

Some Members drew the attention of the House to the question of national purpose. It is very vague. What is the national purpose? What is the purpose of University education? Is the Minister thinking that the Universities should teach only those subjects which are approved by the conservative orthodox people? Or, does he mean that the Universities should also function as citadels of change? After all, nowadays, new values are coming up and new ideas are growing. Does the Minister want the growing? Does the Minister want the Universities to teach only those 19th century and 18th century ideas, does he want that the Universities should function as citadels of change, as the media of change? If he wants this, I think the responsibility to fix the national purpose should not be left with the Government. The Universities themselves should judge which should be the national policy, which should be the correct type of education. By taking this power, what are we doing? We are only bureaucratising the educational system. We have bureaucratised so many things in this country. Through this Bill, we want to bureaucratisise even our educational system and stifle it. We are taking away freedom from the Universities. After all, freedom should be the basis of University education or any kind of education. If freedom is not given, if autonomy is not assured to the Universities, I do not think we will be getting the right type of education. Today, the teachers are terribly afraid of expressing their opinions on great issues. I know of a particular instance. A University professor was asked to explain his conduct about why he spoke in a particular way in meeting. That is how our university professors have been gagged continuously by the Ministers. It is unfortunate. Today there is no freedom of expression in the portals of the university, and the university teachers are not free to teach any good things they want to teach to the students; and everything is directed, everything is imposed, and the teachers are in the psychosis of fear. Academic freedom is a great freedom and it is a great

virtue. If you want to raise the standard of university education, you cannot do so by giving power to this Grants Commission. You can bring about high standard in university education by giving greater freedom to the universities, to the teachers and to the taught. Unfortunately, they have got very little freedom in the university portals. That is our bane. That is the disease of our educational institutions.

People complain that the standards of education have deteriorated. That is true. Some Member stated that everybody is complaining that the standard of university education has deteriorated but nobody gives a solution, nobody can give a correct analysis. I would say there has been too much interference by stupid and bureaucratic officials or misguided Ministers, and that is the main reason why the standard of university education has gone down. It will go down, and neither the University Grants Commission nor your Government will help to achieve the purpose for which the Bill is placed before us. I am sure many Members will agree with me that the greatest virtue of university education lies in freedom and freedom alone. If you give enough freedom to the academic people and if you take away all the pressures of communal intrigues and free the universities from continuous.....

Mr. Chairman: All this is very interesting, but it has hardly anything to do with the Bill.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: I am pleading that the standard of university education can only be raised and maintained at a higher level by granting more freedom, not by taking away freedom from the universities. That is my point. I wish that this Bill is drastically altered and the function of the Grants Commission is limited to the bare purpose of granting the funds to the universities, the matter of co-ordination of university education being left to a different body. These are my views and I leave this question for the consideration of the House.

Dr. M.M. Das : The hon. Member wanted to know the page of the University Commission's Report from which I quoted.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister will get a chance and he can say whatever he has to say when his turn comes.

Now, it is already 3 O'Clock. Three hours were given for the consideration stage. They are practically over, and I have yet to call the hon. Minister. So, I am very sorry that I cannot call any more hon. Minister at this stage. Those Members who are anxious to speak may kindly speak on the amendments or at the third reading stage.

Dr. M.M. Das : I have listened with great interest and attention to the debate which has followed my motion. A large number of hon. Members of this House have taken part in the debate and there can be no doubt that we have derived much benefit from their views.

A number of very important issues have been raised during the discussions which require careful consideration not only by Government but by this august House. I will take these issues one by one and try to place before hon. Members the considered opinion of the Government of India about each of them.

The most important question that has featured very prominently in the debate is the question of the autonomy of our universities. Hon. Members who dealt with this question in some detail seem to be divided in their opinion. Some speakers were staunch advocates of university autonomy and they were not prepared to give any authority whatsoever in the hands of either the Commission or the Government of India, except perhaps the authority of giving money. Although the provisions of this Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee ensure the fullest autonomy of our universities and have virtually reduced the University Grants Commission into an advisory, recommendatory body, many of my friends are not satisfied. On the other hand, there are hon. Members who think that enough power has not been given into the hands of the Commission to enable them to discharge the duty which has been entrusted to them. It is not necessary for me at this stage of the debate to repeat the arguments on the one side or the other, but it may suffice to say that Government considers it expedient and desirable to be guided by the collective wisdom of the Joint Committee. Although no authority, no power has been given into the hands of the Commission, we hope that good sense will prevail upon our universities and friendly counsel, sincere advice and persuasion will win the day.

The House knows that the existing University Grants Commission was set up about two years back by a resolution of the Government of India. We have watched with keen interest the present University Grants Commission's working for nearly two years. This Commission has disbursed up till now Rs. 3-1/2 crores to the different universities of our country. There has been no difficulty at all, no complaint from any quarter. Up till now the Grants Commission and the universities have worked together in perfect harmony, in complete unity. They have worked together in great harmony as a united team, inspired by a noble purpose – the development and well-being of our universities. The present Grants Commission has received the most sincere co-operation

from the universities and our universities have never felt that their autonomy has been infringed upon. So, I assure this hon. House that although this Commission has been reduced by the Joint Committee to an innocuous, powerless body, there will be no difficulty at all in achieving our goal, in achieving the object for which this Bill has been brought before the House.

The next point that I propose to take is the question of the affiliated colleges. Nearly all the Members who have taken part in the debate have expressed great concern at the precarious financial condition of the affiliated colleges of our country. The Government of India agree to and fully share the views of the hon. Members. There can be no two opinions about the condition of our affiliated colleges. But the whole thing boils down to the question of the financial condition of the Government of India, *i.e.* the question as to what is the amount that the Government of India can place at the disposal of the University Grants Commission for disbursement. Under these circumstances, the Joint Committee have taken the wisest course. They have kept the door open for all affiliated colleges to come in wherever finances permit. If I have understood my hon. friend Shri T.S.A. Chettiar correctly, he said in his speech that it should be specifically mentioned in the Bill itself that the post-graduate colleges should be the first to come in. We say, let the universities and the University Grants Commission judge; let the discretion be placed at the hands of the universities and the University Grants Commission. If the universities and the University Grants Commission think it desirable to bring in the post-graduate college first, let them do so; there is nothing in the Bill to prevent them from doing so. We want that the door should remain open and therefore there will be no impediment in the way of the University Grants Commission to give grants to the affiliated colleges, if the financial condition permits. Let us hope that the finances of the Government of India will improve in the immediate future, and the Government of India will be able to place sufficient funds at the disposal of the University Grants Commission, so as to enable the Commission to include all the affiliated colleges in the country within the definition of universities and make them entitled to financial assistance from the Centre.

I now come to the composition of the Commission. More than one speaker has suggested that the Commission should be elected instead of selected. I frankly admit that I fail to see any wisdom in this proposition, and there are weighty reasons as to why I say so.

Shri K.K. Basu : It is an unwise view.

Shri V.P. Nayar : When you were a member of the Public Accounts Committee in 1952, you held a different view.

Dr. M.M. Das : Opinions differ just like the opinions of the members in a democratic legislature.

Firstly, election in educational matters is not at all a healthy thing, and should be repudiated by all means.

Shri V.P. Nayar : Give more physical exercise.

Dr. M.M. Das : The Radhakrishnan Commission have rejected the idea of election in universities, and have condemned it in the strongest terms. I do not want to take up the time of the House by giving quotations from their report.

The second reason is that it is a common democratic principle that the person elected is responsible to the electorate only and not to the others. Now, the money that will be disbursed by the University Grants Commission will come from the Consolidated Fund of India.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh : From the people.

Dr. M.M. Das : Yes, the Consolidated Fund of India gets its nourishment from the pockets of the people.

The money will come from the Consolidated Fund of India. The Central Government are responsible to this Parliament for proper expenditure of that money. Now, the members of the Commission will be elected by other people, and they will be entitled or authorised to spend this money. But if the members are elected by others, they will not be responsible either to the Central Government or to this House. Then, what will be the condition of the Central Government? The Central Government will then be placed in a very precarious position; they will have no effective voice in the expenditure of that money, and yet they will be held responsible to this House.

Shri D.C. Sharma : Very fine logic.

Dr. M.M. Das : Thirdly, the analogy of the U.K. University Grants Commission, where all the members are appointed by Government, is only an analogy and not an argument. Yet, we cannot deny the fact that the U.K. University Grants Commission is an ideal one, according to many of us.

Dr. Suresh Chandra : It is not.

Dr. M.M. Das : It is an ideal one. They are working very beautifully, and they are serving as a model to us.

Dr. Suresh Chandra : But they are only a disbursing Commission.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah) : Only you are not following the model.

Dr. M.M. Das : Next, I come to the amendment of Shri Meghnad Saha. I am sorry he is not here at the moment.

Shri V.P. Nayar : How much more should we be sorry because the Education Minister is not here ?

Dr. M.M. Das : That is your business to be sorry for, not mine.

Shri Matthen : Certainly, it is our business, and not yours.

Dr. M.M. Das : It may be recalled that Shri Meghnad Saha was a member of the Radhakrishnan Commission. He was also a member of the Joint Committee on this Bill. But unfortunately the Committee was deprived of his wise counsels because owing to some other preoccupations he could not attend the meetings. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that had he been present at the meetings of the Joint Committee, he would have made substantial contribution to the deliberations of the Committee, and perhaps influenced their decision also.

It is impossible to deny the force of the arguments that have been advanced by Shri Meghnad Saha in support of his amendment. According to Shri Meghnad Saha's amendment — if I have understood it correctly — there should be four specialists of the rank of university professors, in addition to the chairman, and all the five will be full-time officers of Government. These five will form some sort of executive committee of the Commission. In addition to these five full-time members, there may be part-time members, as provided in the Bill, who will occasionally meet and discuss important questions. As I have said already, there is much to be said in favour of his amendment. But I am afraid that a Commission that will be set up according to Shri Meghnad Saha's amendment will be branded by my hon. friends as an appendage of the Central Government or as a department of the Central Government.

Shri K.K. Basu : It depends upon the type of people you nominate.

Dr. M.M. Das : And it will be resented to also by our Vice-Chancellors and university authorities. Under these conditions, in the teeth of opposition of my hon. friends and the universities, and to some extent, the Vice-Chancellors also, Government do not consider it desirable to accept in full the suggestions made by Shri Meghnad Saha.

Shri Matthen : You are accepting them in part.

Dr. M.M. Das : I shall come to that. Do not be impatient. But I can assure my hon. friend Shri Meghnad Saha that the mind of Government

is already working in the direction which he has suggested. Shri Meghnad Saha himself knows that Government propose to set up panels of experts in the different branches of education to assist the Commission. He himself has been invited to serve on some of the panels, and in the future also he is sure to be invited. For the time being, we propose to meet Shri Meghnad Saha half way.

Government intend that the office of the chairman should be a whole-time salaried one. I understand that my hon. friend Shri B.K. Das has given notice of an amendment to this effect. We are going to accept that amendment. Shri Meghnad Sabha is not present here now, and therefore there is no good requesting him to withdraw his amendment, and probably he will not be here also to move his amendment.

Shri K.K. Basu : Why predict his future movements ?

Dr. M.M. Das : Moreover, for the present, the work of the Commission is not so heavy as to warrant the appointment of five full-time officers. So far the time being, Government think that one full-time Chairman, and other members will be enough to carry out satisfactorily the work of the Commission. Moreover, let us have the experience of the working of this Commission. Let us see for a year or two how things happen and then if we find – if the House finds – that there is a real necessity for having more than one full-time officer as suggested by Shri Meghnad Saha Government will have no objection at all in bringing some amendment to that effect and amending the composition of the Commission.

Regarding the functions of the Commission, I have not much to say, if there is any dissatisfaction about the functions of the Commission, it is because many of the hon. Members here think that the scope of the Commission has been unduly restricted, has been unduly narrowed. Many hon. Members think that the powers and functions of the Commission are not enough for the discharge of their duties. There is another reason why the powers had to be restricted. Many hon. Members – including Dr. Jaisooria – wanted to give full powers about University Education in the hands of the Central Government. He is prepared to give the power; but Government are not prepared to take the power because the Constitution stands in the way. The House will remember that education is a State subject. This Parliament has got no constitutional authority behind it to legislate upon education except on one single item, item 66 of the Union List, about co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education in the country. I have said that the Government of India have no constitutional

sanction behind them to go beyond item 66 of the Union List. This is the reason why the functions of this Commission had to be restricted.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee asked one pointed question, why emphasis on determination of standards and not on expansion of education. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the activities of this Commission, will expand the scope of higher education in the country. But I am not at all ashamed to tell Shri H.N. Mukerjee and others that the primary object of this Bill is to discharge the responsibility placed upon the Central Government by our Constitution, namely, co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education.

Now I shall deal with some specific points that have cropped up. It is not possible for me to discuss all the points mentioned by hon. Members on the floor of the House, but only some of them. My hon. friend, Shri T.S.A. Chettiar, raised the question of the development of regional languages. He wants a specific provision to be incorporated in the Bill to this effect. My friend is afraid that the Government of India may interfere through the University Grants Commission with the medium of instruction in our Universities. This very apprehension – fear, has been expressed by more than one Member coming from the southern part of our country. I remind Shri Chettiar and other friends who have expressed such apprehension – that on more than one occasion, the spokesmen of the Government of India, including a person no less than the Prime Minister, have said that all the 14 languages mentioned in the Constitution of India are national languages and it is not the policy of the Government of India – and it cannot be the policy of the Government of India – to give any preferential treatment to any one of these languages at the cost of the other, to the detriment of the other.

Shri Veeraswamy: We cannot speak in our regional languages in Parliament.

Dr. M.M. Das : It is the sincere desire of the Governemnt of India to give all possible help for the development of all the 14 Indian languages. My hon. friend, Shri T.S.A. Chettiar, asked the Government of India one pointed question, whether the medium of instruction in the Universities can be regarded as a matter of national policy. I categorically say in the floor of this House; on behalf of the Governemtn of India, under the direction of the Minister of Education, that the Government have no intention of making the media of instruction in our Universities a question of policy. The Government of India desire that our Universities

will have the fullest independence with regard to their media of instruction; Government have no intention at all of interfering with the media of instruction of our Universities. We propose to clarify this point in the rules also framed under the Act.

My hon. friend, Shri D.C. Sharma, from Punjab, put me a specific question – why full responsibility for education is not taken up by the Central Government? My hon. friend is not here

Shri Matthen : He is very much here.

Dr. M.M. Das : I would like to tell him that I am simply amazed as well as amused by his question. My hon. friend is a professor of a celebrated University of this country. He is here in this House for about four years. I appeal to him to refresh his memory by a fresh reading of the Constitution.

Shri Matthen: You can have one more amendment.

Dr. M.M. Das : The Government of India cannot take the full responsibility for education because education is a State subject; it is not a Central subject.

Shri Matthen: You can bring in an amendment.

Shri D.C. Sharma : We are amending the Constitution in so many ways, and I would ask the hon. Minister to take over the entire fabric of education. The Constitution can be amended in that respect also.

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad) :Yes, this is a different thing. Such a question did not arise in this connection. If the hon. Member wants that the Constitution be changed in this respect, they can bring forth an amendment to this effect; but this question does not arise in connection with the University Grants Commission.

Dr. M.M. Das : Many doubts have been expressed by hon. Members about 'national purpose'. What is a national purpose?— that particular question has been put to this House by more than one hon. Member. Even many lawyer friends here have found it very difficult to give a proper definition of what is a national purpose. But I think the University Education Commission presided over by Dr. Radhakrishnan has thrown some light upon it, which may be considered as enough for ordinary practical purposes. It may not serve the purpose of lawyers, but I have no doubt that it will serve the purpose of the Grants Commission. This is what the University Education Commission has said:

“In some subjects, there is felt to be the need, without imparting local initiative, for a coordinating power to be

retained by the Centre – (a) to ensure that all provinces, States and Unions act within certain limits or observe certain minimum standards, (b) to ensure that where different units wish to develop different special activities, a coherent overall national policy emerges without glaring examples of unnecessary duplication on the one hand or unfilled gaps on the other, and (c) to enable joint planning by provinces, States and Unions where this is necessary.”

Then, I refer to the speech of Dr. N.C. Chatterjee. He is not here. He waxed eloquent about the autonomy of the Universities and supported the amendment of Dr. Saha. Dr. Chatterjee.....

An Hon. Member: Not Dr. Chatterjee but Shri Chatterjee.

Dr. M.M. Das : I am sorry. Shri N.C. Chatterjee in his speech referred to the composition of the Commission and said that one whole-time salaried officer as Chairman and other members will give every power to the Government which will be detrimental to the interests of the Universities. But, he supported the amendment of Dr. Meghnad Saha which proposes that an executive committee should be set up consisting of 5 members, all salaried whole-time officers of the Government. I think these two are contradictory to each other.

Lastly, I want to say a few words about the speech of my hon. friend Shri Gurupadaswamy.

Shri V.P. Nayar: He is also not here.

Dr. M.M. Das : One point in his speech which attracted my attention was that the University Professors have nowadays under the Congress regime got no independence at all. Perhaps my hon. friend does not know about Dr. Meghnad Saha. He is the head of a very important department, the Department of Nuclear Science in the Calcutta University.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh : He is an exception.

Dr. M. M. Das : I have nothing more to say. At least these exceptions sometimes show the truth. My hon. friend said many other things misquoting scriptures like

Some Hon. Members : Like ?

Dr. M.M. Das : I do not want to refer to that again. I have taken a considerable portion of the time of the House and I think I have been able to cover most of the important points that have been raised by hon. Members.

Shri V.P. Nayar : If you think so, it is all right.

Mr. Chairman : The question is :

“That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose to establish a University Grants Commission, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 – (Definitions)

Mr. Chairman: The question is :

“That clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : Sir, there are amendments to this clause.

Mr. Chairman. That is why I have placed the clause before the House. Otherwise how can there be an amendment?

There are three amendments to this clause, Nos. 5, 20 and 21. I want to know whether hon. Members want to move any of them.

Shri V.P. Nayar: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 7–

for “and includes any such institution as may” *substitute:*

“and includes any institution affiliated to a University and also such institutions as may.”

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 7–

after “includes” insert:

“any institution undertaking post-graduate teaching and research and.”

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved:

Page 2, line 7–

for “any includes any such institution as may” substitute:

“and includes any institution affiliated to a University and also such institutions as may”

Page 2, line 7–

after “includes” insert:

“any institution undertaking post-graduate teaching and research and”

Anybody to move No. 21? None.

Shri B.K. Das (Contai) : Sir, today a notice was given to move an amendment.

Mr. Charirman: The notice was given today? I am sorry, the hon. Member knows the rules. The hon. Member knows fully well that unless the hon. Minister is willing to accept it, it cannot be moved. If he is willing to accept that, I will certainly allow it to be moved; if he does not accept it, then the rule is it cannot be allowed to be moved.

Dr. M.M. Das : It is necessary that we on our part must accept the amendment; otherwise, will he not be able to move it?

Mr. Chairman: That is the rule. If the hon. Minister is willing to accept it, then I will allow it to be moved.

Dr. M.M. Das : Sir, I am not accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Then, I am sorry I cannot allow that to be moved.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I am glad that at least when all the Members have expressed their views and when the Parliamentary Secretary was coming to the end of his speech, the Minister of Education has chosen to be present in the House.

My amendment is a very simple one. I want the term 'University' to include certain other institutions which are affiliated to the University for certain specific reasons. We know that for years now the Government have been telling us that it is not possible, in view of very short finances at their disposal, to give the Universities grants which they deserve. Time and again we have been told that beyond what is now being done it is impossible to go. When the hon. Parliamentary Secretary was making his reply, I heard him repeat that once again. We do not say that overnight it will be possible; but we must also consider that in certain other matters, this Government has given large sums of money. For example, you will find that in the recent past about Rs. 10 to Rs. 20 crores have been given to the Tata Iron and Steel Comapny as grant and loan. You find that even without adequate provision being made in the Budget, a sum of Rs. 3 crores was given to a pharmaceutical firm which is in partnership with a foreign firm and the amount of Rs. 3 crores was included only in a supplementary grant. When Government can run down the drain enormous sums of money, I do ont think it is an excuse worth considering that it is not possible for the Government to accommodate the Universities with more money. I do not want to go into the question in detail either.

When I say that other institutions also should be included in the term 'University', I want to bring to the attention of the House, and

especially to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education who is happily here now, certain happenings in some of the colleges affiliated to the University in the State from which I come. As you know, both from the point of view of school education and higher education, my State, Travancore-Cochin, stands first in India. You will find that in almost every house out of four there is one person, man or woman, sitting idle after University education. We have got 48 colleges, 6 affiliated to the Madras University and 42 to the Travancore University. In recent years, there has been a tendency for communal organisations trying their best to compete with each other in setting up colleges. In the last two or three years, we have several colleges set up; one college by a communal organisation known as the S.N.D.P. Society. We have got colleges run by certain sections of Christians and we are going to have a college started by Muslims. That is a very peculiar position. They are private institutions affiliated to the University. For such colleges building always come up on account of liberal subscriptions by the public. The organisers of the college go about and collect from the public sums of money. They also collect in kind; they collect paddy, bananas and coconuts – everything – and sell them. The result is that even after all this, these colleges present to the students almost insurmountable difficulties in the matter of continuing their education. I want the Education Minister to understand certain aspect of this and try to do anything he can in the matter of relieving the distress of the students.

Last year, in one of the private colleges affiliated to the Travancore University, a course was started for graduation in biology. That is a college run by the N.S. Society at Pandalam, and in this college a student seeking admission for a B.Sc. course in biology, has to give the college authorities a compulsory donation of Rs. 300. If you apply with a first class in the Intermediate and go to the college, you are given an interview by the Principal, but the Principal will see you only when you have with you a receipt for the deposit of Rs. 300 as your donation; and if you do not give that donation, admission is not given to you. This is not a very isolated case. Almost in every private college in my State, a student, who seeks admission in the Intermediate Class, has to give a bribe – I call it ‘bribe’ because it is not donation when it is made compulsory – of Rs. 50. In one college run by the Jacobites in Pattanam Thitta – my hon. friend Shri Matthen may be knowing it very well – last year every Intermediate student was called upon to pay Rs. 200 per year. In 1954 that college had over 2000 applications, and when this fee

was raised to Rs. 200, this year they had hardly applications from about 500 students. When a Government college charges Rs. 120 per year, you find that in all these private colleges the student has to pay 25 per cent. more for B.A. or B.Sc. If the fee is Rs. 13-8-0 per month for eight months in a Government college, the private colleges have to be paid Rs. 16 or 17 per month. Besides the tuition fee, there is a laboratory fee when there is no laboratory. I know in the Intermediate Class some of our lecturers are very competent men because of their ingenuity to teach the students without the apparatus — holding a fountain-pen-cap they say that supposing this is a test tube and when potassium chlorate is heated in the test tube, what happens in this. This is the kind of teaching that is going on, and I am not saying this in any jovial spirit, but this is what I am seeing in my State. This is not happening in private colleges alone but it also happens in Government colleges. Athletic fees are collected from students and I know there are colleges in my State where there is not even a single playground, but still the boys are called upon to pay Rs. 4 or so. There are library fees charged by certain private institutions where the library does not even have a hundred books in all.

Dr. M.M. Das : It is a matter for the State to look into.

Shri V.P. Nayar : It may be for the State, but here we are considering how to control and finance certain activities and how to enlarge the scope of university education, and in this context my amendment becomes relevant and I cannot establish the necessity for my amendment unless I give some very concrete instances. Take the case of the N.S.S. College at Pandalam and I have the occasion to see it whenever I go to my State. About 1,000 students are taking up various courses and you will be surprised to know that in the whole compound of the college there is not even a single well, and all the students, the moment the bell is rung for the interval, rush to a market place which is a furlong away for water. This is what is happening in private colleges. I do not say that private colleges have done nothing for the cause of education, but at least in Travancore-Cochin today the communal organisations are trying to get hold of certain colleges, they are trying to increase their monopoly and it is about time that we cry halt to such nonsense which is practised on the students. I had occasion the other day to discuss this matter with the most representative body of the Travancore-Cochin students. When I was talking to them, I was amazed to find that in one of the private colleges in Trivandrum, a man who passed out from the University with a B.Sc. in the third class in Physics was appointed as a physical director because the rules of the

University prohibit the appointment of anybody without a Master's degree for teaching the subjects. It so happened that this fortunate gentleman had a chance to play for the class badminton side, not for the college but for the class team, and that was considered to be a qualification to appoint him as a physical director. And on appointment as physical director, he was taking physics for the Intermediate Class. This happens even today. My friend Shri Das may very well say that it is a matter for the Travancore Government.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : Travancore University.

Shri V.P. Nayar : But what can the University do? The students bring the matter to the notice of the University and if the University does not take any action, what should they do? Why I want these institutions also included in the definition of 'University' is that however limited the scope of the Bill may be, there is a provision for this Commission to inspect the universities. In such cases, the students of such private colleges.....

Dr. M.M. Das : Then the autonomy of the universities will go.

Shri V.P. Nayar: It is not merely a question of autonomy. You are providing here in the powers and functions of the Commission for them to go and inspect the university. Only the Commission will have to write to the executive head of the university. I want this to be extended to the private colleges affiliated to the university because that has become very necessary. I do not know what is happening in private colleges in other States. Without exception, it is the rule in the State of Travancore-Cochin, which has the highest education in the country, that every private college is putting the students to these hardships. Yet there is such heavy rush in all the colleges for admission.

There is a medical college in Trivandrum, an institution which is very imposing in sight, built up at a cost of not less than Rs. 50,00,000. I want to give a very concrete instance as an argument for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman: These things happening every province. If the hon. Member goes on multiplying examples, that does not give much strength to his argument. What he has said is enough. He has described the condition as being simply deplorable. That will do, I think.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I described certain appalling conditions which obtain in private colleges. I want to give one instance of what is obtaining at a Government college which is also affiliated to the University. I do not want to multiply instances and I am not in the know of things in the private colleges in other States. There is a medical

college, as I told you, which has consumed several lakhs of rupees. We have got very eminent surgeons there. I am giving you this very small instance. In the last few months or one year, that medical college, which has got very eminent surgeons of all-India reputation and doctors who have passed the F.R.C.S. and have had world tours, could not undertake such a simple operation as an operation for stones in kidneys. It so happened that the ex-Minister T.M. Verghese had gone there for having this operation done, but the doctors there would not take a risk with him although the college is run by Government and is affiliated to the University of Travancore. What I understood was that this institution which teaches the Medicoes how to become surgeons, which teaches the doctors how to administer for remedying diseases, does not have the most fundamental requirement of a qualified anaesthetist. As you know, the science of medicine has developed to such an extent that drugs like chloroform in anaesthesia have gone out of the pharmacopocia.

I ask this question. These doctors are trained in this college which has an operation theatre without an anaesthetist. When the doctors who are qualified feel reluctant to undertake a very ordinary operation for want of an anaesthetist, what will be the effect of such teaching on the doctors of the future? How can they develop a sort of a confidence without seeing operations on human body when it is alive? It is not enough if they are shown things in the mortuary. It is not enough if they are shown or told: 'this is the way to do appendicectomy or this is the way to do gastro-jejunosotomy'. My point is that it is not merely an evil confined to private colleges run by private individuals. You will find them in colleges run by State Governments – due to lack of proper perspective and lack of love for the cause of students, due to the complete ignorance of what the technical institutions have necessarily to incorporate in their administration.

The University Grants Commission, although it has a very limited purpose, will have one little opportunity to probe into such matters. It is, therefore, that I plead that Government may please accept my amendment and bring within the scope of this Bill the private colleges and Government colleges which are affiliated to the universities.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: In moving my amendment which is of a limited nature, I want to include "any institution undertaking post-graduate teaching and research". The matter which was raised by Shri Nayar was earnestly considered in the Joint Committee and everybody was for it because we know that affiliated colleges of all kinds did require help. But the difficulty is, as the Minister pointed out, paucity

of funds. It was felt by them that the conditions in the affiliated colleges should be made better. But at present their funds do not permit of such a large expansion. In this matter the Ministry would like to go by stages and we appreciate that point of view. I hope the first stage will be with regard to post-graduate education. We have so many thousands of graduates and the real standards of a university are set by post-graduate classes – the second degree courses – M.As., Honours and post-graduate courses. I would like to suggest that that should claim the first attention of the Government. Now they are giving help to universities which are only 31 in number of which four are Central universities. The rest are State universities. The programme is to extend it to other institutions. I would suggest that the next expansion should be for the post-graduate courses.

Shri Nayar referred to the loan to Tatas. To my mind that is not relevant in this connection because they grant a loan and finish with it. But these are recurring grants and they are of considerably long term nature because they have to be given every year. So, I would like the Government to choose whatever is most essential to begin with. I hope the Government will accept this suggestion that to begin with in giving help to affiliated or Government colleges it will be by selection of colleges providing for post-graduate courses. We have over 9,000 and odd colleges and the number of colleges which provide post-graduate instruction will be about 500 only. I think Government should be able to do it. I hope the Government will accept the idea contained in this amendment.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central): In clause 2, a university is being defined. So far as it goes it is good but I would like to draw your attention to a recommendation made by the University Education Commission. On page 552, they have said:

“In many countries of the world universities are set up not through Acts of legislature of their Parliaments, but through charters granted by the head of the State. This course may also be adopted in our country, at any rate, with regard to the new universities which are established by the conversion of existing institutions. It may be thought necessary that such institutions be given provisional university status before they are recognised permanently as universities. Such charters may be granted by the head of the State on the recommendation of the University Grants Commission.

The recommendation of that Commission should indicate the conditions and the time for which the provisional charter is granted. These charters may be made permanent if the Commission is satisfied about the staff, management and quality of work done."

This indicates that there is a necessity that the University Grants Commission should be empowered to make recommendations to the President for granting charters for new universities or for such of the institutions as are going to be made universities.

In the definition as has been given, it says that a university means such institutions established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act. But such institutions as are to be raised to the status of a university are not included. I think that it is the recommendation of the University Education Commission that this University Grants Commission when it is established with all the other powers should be granted this power also. When an existing institution – either affiliated or independent – has to be raised to the status of a university, it will not be done in the beginning by an Act of the Central Government but the President of the Union should be empowered to give charters to enable that institution to function as a provisional university.

Dr. M.M. Das : Clause 3 already does that.

Shri Shree Narayan Das : It reads: "The Central Government may, on the advice of the Commission, declare by notification in the official Gazette that any institution for higher education other than a University, shall be deemed to be a University for the purposes of this Act.....clause (f) of section 2."

Mr. Chairman: Moreover, clause 12(e) also refers to the establishment of new universities and expansion of the activities of any university.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: My idea is this. The University Grants Commission without being asked to do so, if any application is made by the public or those who are conducting such institutions, if the Commission considers that to be a fit institution to be raised to the status of a university, it should have the power to recommend so to the President without making any enactment or law by the Central or State Governments. The President will give charters for the provisional functioning of that institution. That is not there in this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: This Commission is not supposed to make any recommendation to the President.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I want that this should be done. According to the recommendation made by the University Education Commission, it should be granted this power also. This should be one of the functions. I would, therefore, suggest that its functioning should be enlarged in order that it may be able to cover what I have just said and what has been given in the University Education Commission's report. If the Government is not able to accept it, then it is for the Government to decide.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any amendment to this effect?

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I had submitted one amendment along with Shri B.K. Das but you were not pleased to allow it.

Mr. Chairman: How is it going to be implemented then?

Shri V.P. Nayar: When there is no amendment, there is no speech also.

Shri D.C. Sharma : I happen to agree with the remarks made by Shri V.P. Nayar and Shri Chettiar though I must admit that I am doing so for different reasons. I think Shri Chettiar's contention will be covered entirely if the amendment of Shri V.P. Nayar is accepted. I say this not because there are denominational institutions being run in some States or because the equipment there is not very good. I say this for the simple reason that in a University you cannot create two nations: one the actual university and the other affiliated colleges which constitute the university. There should be only one set of regulations and rules to govern all that is meant by a university. I know in some universities you have university departments and also affiliated colleges. Now you want that you should give money to those university departments and not to these affiliated colleges. I think this is highly discriminatory. The purpose of the University Grants Commission Bill, if I have understood it aright, is to level up education at the post-graduate standard unless you raise the standard of education of degree standard or of undergraduate standard. Therefore I say that it is in the fitness of things that the affiliated colleges should be included along with the universities.

There are other reasons also. Sir, you must have read in the papers that in India we are now thinking in terms of city universities. Kanpur is going to have a university and there are other big cities in India which are going to have universities of their own. Not only that. We are thinking of what you may call 'rural universities'. Of course, we may not have rural universities for some time to come but I can tell you that in my own constituency there are three colleges which are run at rural centres, at small centres consisting of about 300 inhabitants. I tell you

those degree colleges are serving a very useful purpose. I know of a degree college in my small constituency, Haryana, where about 400 students of the Harijan community are studying. These colleges, therefore, are serving a very useful purpose. Unless the University Grants Commission makes up its mind to be generous not only to the university departments but also to the centres of education at congested cities. I think the problem of education of India, — it would be solved no doubt by this Bill, — would be solved very imperfectly and very inadequately.

At the same time, we are now living in the context of a socialistic pattern of society and the socialistic pattern of society requires that we should give the same kind of treatment to all. We cannot discriminate between university departments and colleges which are affiliated to the Universities but which are not part and parcel of the Universities. I would, therefore, say that the affiliated colleges should also be included here.

Again, as has been pointed out so many times on the floor of this House, we have to do something to improve the pay scales of teachers. I know everybody is agreed on that point. The Education Ministry also agrees on that point and Professor Humayun Kabir has been talking about it so many times. But, you cannot improve the pay scales of these persons; you cannot improve the equipment of these colleges and you cannot improve the educational facilities that are given by these affiliated colleges unless you say that they will receive also their share of the grant which will be given to the university departments. I cannot understand the logic that this University Grants Commission should be there for these 38 universities. What are these 38 universities if you do not have the affiliated colleges? These 38 universities are merely a shell and the affiliated colleges are, I should say, the real body of the universities.

Mr. Chairman : The words here are :

“.... any such institution as may, on the recommendation of the University concerned, be recognised by the Commission in accordance with the regulations made in this behalf under this Act.”

My question is whether the affiliated colleges if they are recognised by the universities will not come under this?

Shri T.S. A. Chettiar : If they satisfy the conditions mentioned in clause 3.

Mr. Chairman : Therefore, it is not a case of complete exclusion of such colleges. The only thing is that a condition is imposed on them that they must be recognised in accordance with the regulations made in that behalf.

Shri D.C. Sharma : I think this is very self explanatory. By my amendment I want to add "and includes any institution affiliated to a university."

Mr. Chairman : I know the trend of the amendment. I wanted only to know whether the affiliated colleges, if they are recognised, will come under this or not.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : Only such affiliated colleges are recognised by the Commission on the recommendation of the universities will come under this.

Shri D. C. Sharma : What will happen is this. There will be a technical college, there will be a professional college, there will be law college or there will be a medical college and the university may recommend that a particular sum of money may be given to a particular college. Therefore, what I say is, even if they are included in this the ambiguity should be removed. If they are included in this I am happy, but I would suggest that the ambiguity should be removed and the whole thing should be made crystal clear. The words "affiliated colleges" should be put in so that university education is imparted in university colleges is treated in the same way as that of university departments. I know there are so many colleges which impart education to post-graduate students.

Therefore, this is a very innocuous amendment and I am sure the hon. Minister will accept it.

Dr. M.M. Das : We appreciate greatly the anxiety of the hon. Members for improving the conditions of the affiliated colleges in this country. The Government is fully conscious of the precarious conditions in which these affiliated colleges at present are. The Government would have been only too glad to give financial assistance to these colleges if their own financial conditions permitted them. As I have said before the whole question of accepting these amendments boils down to the financial condition of the Government of India. We have not got sufficient funds at our disposal so that these affiliated colleges whose number will be more than 700 or 800 may be given substantial financial help which will really improve their condition. This question was discussed in great detail in the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee

thought that the door should be open and that they should make such a provision that whenever financial condition permits the University Grants Commission to give monetary help to those colleges, it should be able to do it. So, what we thought better has been included in this provision. On the recommendation of the university concerned, 'the University Grants Commission will be able to give financial help to the affiliated colleges. It depends fully upon the financial condition of the University Grants Commission. The money that the University Grants Commission has got at its disposal will be given to the affiliated colleges, if that money is sufficient. If it is not sufficient, it cannot be helped. But the door is open. So, I think, for the time being, the provision as it exists is all right.

Shri V.P. Nayar : The door is closed.

Dr. M.M. Das : Then, my hon. friend Shri T. S. A. Chettiar has raised a point regarding post-graduate colleges with which we are in sympathy. But our only difference is that on the side of Government, we want to give the discretion in the hands of the universities as well as the Commission. If the University Grants Commission feels and thinks it proper that the post-graduate colleges should be helped next to the universities themselves, they can do it. There is nothing in this provision to prevent it. So, every way is open. Full discretion lies with the University Grants Commission and the universities, – both the parties. I think that the position as explained by me will satisfy the hon. Members.

Mr. Chairman : I shall put the amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is :

Page 2 line 7 –

for “and includes any such institutions as may” *substitute :*

“ and includes any institution affiliated to a university
and also such institutions as may”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman : The question is :

Page 2 line 7 –

after “includes” *insert*

“ any institution undertaking post-graduate teaching and
research and”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman : The question is :

“ That clause 2 stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 3 and 4 were added to the Bill.

Clause 5 – (Composition of the Commission)

Shri V.P. Nayar : I beg to move:

Page 2 –

(i) line 26, for “nine members” *substitute* “seventeen members”;

(ii) *after* line 30, *insert*:

“(aa) not less than four members representing the faculties of engineering, medicine and technology”;

(iii) *for* lines 33 to 35, *substitute* :

“(c) for members from among persons of all India repute as educationists and with a minimum of fifteen years’ experience in the field of education”; and

(iv) *after* line 35, *add*:

“(d) one member to be elected by the Inter-’Varsity Board;

(e) two members to be elected by the members of Lok Sabha from among themselves; and

(f) one member to be elected by Rajya Sabha from among themselves;”

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : I beg to move:

Page 2, line 29 –

omit “not less than”.

Shri Matthen : I beg to move:

Page 2, line 29 –

for “not less than” *substitute* “not more than”.

Shri K.C. Sodhia : I beg to move :

Page 2, line 29 –

for “less” *substitute* “more”

Shri K.K. Baus : I beg to move :

(i) Page, line 29 –

for “three members” *substitute* “five members”.

(2) Page 2, line 30 –

add at the end :

“ to be elected by the Vice-Chancellors themselves”.

Shri Matthen : I be to move :

Page 2, line 31 –

for “two members” *substitute* ... “one member”.

Shrimati Jayashri : I beg to move :

Page 2 line 33 –

after “ the remaining number” *insert*: “of whom at least one shall be a woman”.

Shri K.K. Basu : I beg to move :

Page 2, line 35 –

add at the end:

“ half of such members shall be elected by the members of Parliament and the other half to be elected by the Syndicates or the Executive Councils of the different Universities.”

Shri V. P. Nayar : I beg to move :

Page 3 –

for lines 1 to 3 *substitute* :

“ (3) The Commission shall elect from among its members a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman and a Secretary.”

Shri Shree Narayan Das : I beg to move:

Page 2, line 36 –

for “ one-half’ *substitute* “two-thirds”.

Shri K.K. Basu : I beg to move :

Page 2 –

(i) line 36,

for “not less than one-half” *substitute* not more than one-fourth”; and

(ii) line 37,

omit “not”.

(2) Page 3. line 2 –

after “Commission” insert “ on its recommendation”.

Shri Matthen : I beg to move :

Page 3, line 3 –

after “state Government” insert:

“ or the Vice-Chancellor of a University”.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : I beg to move :

(1) Page 2, line 29 –

for “three members” substitute “four members”

(2) page 2 –

after line 32, insert :

“ (bb) two members from among the members of Parliament; and”.

Mr. Chairman : All the amendments are now before the House.

Now, we have already devoted one hour to one clause. I am afraid we take too much time on the clauses, and at this rate, we will not be able to dispose of all the clauses in time. We have very limited time at our disposal. We have been given four hours for this Bill and some time has already been taken by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education for his reply. So, in the limited time that we have got, we have to see that all the clauses are disposed of. Therefore, I request hon. Members to be brief.

Shri V. P. Nayar : It is our anxiety to be as brief as possible and at the same time to try our utmost to find out common agreement, because it is a question which decides the fate of several thousands of our young men.

Mr. Chairman : I am also interested in seeing that a much time as possible should be given. It was at my suggestion that the Speaker was pleased to give four hours to this stage. But at the same time, we must see that all the clauses are reached within the time allotted.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : We might fix five minutes for the speeches on each amendment.

Mr. Chairman : Hon. members may themselves exercise a restriction on their speeches. I do not want to press on them this matter every time. Yes, Shri Chettiar.

Shri T. S. A Chettiar : This clause was a matter of considerable importance in the discussions in the Joint Committee. Our Constitution differs from the British Constitution in respect of the University Grants Commission. In Britain, we do not have Vice-Chancellors at all on the Commission. If the Vice-Chancellor is appointed, he resigns Vice-Chancellorship to make sure of the impartiality of the people who are getting the funds. In the circumstances of this country, it was felt that Vice-Chancellors should be given a definite representation. The idea was there must be at least three members. I have moved an amendment which says that there must be "not less than three members". That will mean that there can be scope for more Vice-Chancellor to be appointed to the University Grants Commission. There are also other amendments moved. Shri Matthen has moved an amendment to say that there should be not more than three members. That will mean that there will be Vice-Chancellors not more than three. It may be three or even less. Among the 31 universities, it may happen that some of the best persons may not be able to come and join. I know it for a fact that one of the very prominent Vice-Chancellors was asked to take up the chairmanship of the Commission but he declined it because he could not leave his place. And so good persons may not be available. While three may be fixed as maximum, I would even accept Shri Matthen's amendment as better than mine. It says "not more than three".

Then there is the question of Government representation. There was a great deal of discussion about this Government representation, in the Joint Committee. The original clause was : "not less than two members". We thought it should be limited to two members so that the Government representation need not be more than what is necessary. Probably, these two members will represent the Finance Ministry as well as the Education Ministry and the others are expected to be non-officials. In regard to the non-officials, a new amendment has been moved. The proviso under clause 5, as it stands, is as follows :

" not less than one-half of the number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government or of any State Government."

The Joint Committee has also made it sure that the Chairman should not be a permanent official in the Central Government or any State Government. To my mind, this is a fairly satisfactory arrangement as it goes today and I would request the House to accept the clause with the little amendments that we have suggested.

There is one other matter and that is with regard to the election. It has been a matter which has been discussed very often. The Radhakrishnan Commission after going through this matter, suggested that elections, as far as possible, may be avoided in the university circles. My own experience of election is that elections create a lot of difficulties and they should be avoided in academic circles. We thought about amending the Madras University Act itself to avoid elections which have created a lot of difficulties. Many hon. Members have pleaded that elections should be introduced, but I am emphatic in my opinion that elections should not be introduced into this academic sphere. I am sure that if the Government nominates the members, it will nominate only proper persons. We can expect the Government to do their job properly.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I do not propose to go into the controversy about details; but I want to submit that if I had the opportunity or right of sending amendments this morning instead of last evening, I should have certainly put in an amendment to clause 5 (2) (a). In this morning's papers, we find that a nomination has been made by the Government to the Commission and that nomination has been given to a person by name Sir C.P. Ramaswamy Ayyar.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : Has he been made Chairman?

Shri V.P. Nayar : No; he has been nominated as a member of the University Grants Commission. Clause 5(2) (a) at present says:

“(a) not less than three members from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities”.

That is what you have now. The point is in the university where I studied, I happen to know what the Vice-Chancellor, as the self-appointed Vice-Chancellor of the Travancore University, had given to the students

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : Mr. Chairman, may I raise a point whether references to individuals can be made in this House?

Shri V. P. Nayar : This morning's papers announced, that a particular gentleman has been appointed to the Commission.

Mr. Chairman : In the first instance, there is no amendment with regard to this; and secondly, the House cannot discuss the name of a person who has been appointed to the University Grants Commission now existing. In future the personnel of the Commission would be decided according to the provisions of this Act. No one has a right to refer to any person by name and describe his qualities or want of

qualities. At this stage I do not know what the hon. Member is about. If he only wanted to say that an announcement has been made this morning, it is enough. I would request him kindly to desist from making any reference to an individual unnecessarily.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I was only submitting that while we are discussing this Bill, we have been forestalled by an announcement about the nomination of a particular gentleman with a well established disrepute. I do not refer to him by name. The point which I wanted to say was that if such an appointment was known yesterday, I would have sent in an amendment. When amendments are being discussed, we can also discuss the clauses of the Bill. Instead of saying "not less than three members from among the Vice-Chancellors of Universities", I would have sent in an amendment saying that between the word "Vice-Chancellors" and "Universities", we should add the words "having an all-India repute."

Mr. Chairman : If the hon. Member wants to move an amendment orally, it cannot be done. What is the use of discussing this now ?

Shri V.P. Nayar : I am only suggesting for the consideration of the Government a modification which is absolutely essential in the context in which we are discussing the Bill today.

Mr. Chairman : As a matter of fact, there is a reservation even there. The hon. Member's point of objection is that such and such a person is not a man of all-India repute. I therefore request the hon. Member to desist from any personal reference either directly or by insinuation.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I am the last person to judge whether there is any indirect meaning in what I say, because the implication is more striking to others. I do not feel anything.

Mr. Chairman : If the hon. Member cannot see anything in his remarks, he ought to accept the advice of the Chair.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I do take your advice with the greatest respect.

Shri Matthen : Is reference to a disreputable person to be avoided?

Mr. Chairman : There is no question of personal reference to any person, whether reputable or otherwise, because the man is not here to defend himself and it becomes a question of very keen controversy whether such things can be discussed by any Member.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I am not referring to that gentleman by name; but I wish to submit that when we have a provision saying that only three members can be taken from among Vice-Chancellors in general. For

example, we know that being a Member of Parliament is a whole-time job. I have the greatest respect and affection for my friend who happens to be a Vice-Chancellor of one of the best universities but I also want to pose this question to him, namely, whether he has chosen the Vice-Chancellor's job as a part-time job or the Membership of Parliament as a part-time job. Besides my friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya, in the Upper House there are two Vice-Chancellors, Dr. Zakir Hussain and Dr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar. There are other Vice-Chancellors and I do not wish to refer to them by name.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : Vice-Chancellors are great intellectual being who can handle two things at one time.

Mr. Chairman : So far as the law goes, we have passed a Bill in this House saying that a person who hold the office of the Vice-Chancellor is not debarred from becoming a Member of Parliament; but at the same time, the hon. Member knows that a committee was appointed by the Speaker to go into this matter. This matter is not to be discussed here.

Shri V.P. Nayar : My friend Mr. Syamnandan Sahaya was saying that Vice-Chancellors have capacity for doing both jobs. With what little knowledge of biology I have, I know that all human brains have a cerebrum and a cerebellum and their functions also are different. It does not need a person to be a Vice-Chancellor to say that two things can be done at the same time. My question is whether we should not leave it to those who are full-time Vice-Chancellors. In several universities, there are part-time Vice-Chancellors in central universities who make it a point to come to the university only when there is a meeting of the Senate or the Syndicate. In the university of my own State, we have a Vice-Chancellor who is a foreigner to the State. He seldom comes to the State; he comes only to preside over the meetings and all the executive job is being entrusted to another person who is called the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. If at all Vice-Chancellors are to be taken, I want this qualification to be laid down that a Vice-Chancellors claim to serve on this Commission shall be considered only if they are devoting their entire time as Vice-Chancellors and do not dabble with politics or religious matters or with something else.

Coming to the next point, I want this Commission to be enlarged. As you find, it has only 9 members. From among the 9 members Government can have their own 'yes' men planted in this Commission because you find that all of them are nominated. Supposing there are 25 Vice-Chancellors, all very competent men, all of very great all India

reputation, none with any disrepute, and all men of great learning and erudition, it is open to the Secretary in the Education department to say that this is the particular Vice-Chancellor who has to go. I can give out a challenge here. Even without the announcement of the Commission, I can write down a list of those persons who will become members of the Commission on account of their position as Vice-Chancellors who will represent the Government, and give it to you. When the Commission is announced, you can compare this list and you will find that I am correct 90 per cent. We know; we have been seeing the activities of the Education Ministry for quite a long time. We know for certain that the Government will fix upon so and so, so and so for these three names. If I give three names of three Vice-Chancellors I am positive I won't err even in one name. It becomes all the more important

Shri D.C. Sharma : Give the names.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I can tell you.

Mr. Chairman : May I just bring to the notice of the hon. Member that it is already 4-30 and I propose to finish this clause by 5 O'clock?

Shri V.P. Nayar : The University Grants Commission will have certain grants from the Government of India. No grant can be sanctioned unless Parliament gives its technical approval.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : Why technical? Full approval.

Shri V.P. Nayar : Technical because the party in power can get it at any time. The fact remains that we are here to record our votes for disbursing any funds from the Consolidated Fund of India. I pose this question to the Government. Why not have confidence in this House and take two members from this House? There are so many educationists in this House. It is not as if these two places are reserved for the Lok Sabha, V.P. Nayar or M.S. Gurupadaswamy will run for that office. There are very eminent educationists in this House and very eminent educationists in the other House. Why not have two Members from the Lok Sabha and one from the Rajya Sabha?

Mr. Chairman : Much more for the reason that the hon. Member himself has advanced that two jobs cannot be combined in one man.

Shri V.P. Nayar : They are not going to function as whole-time officers.

Shri Achuthan : Where is the answer to this?

Mr. Chairman : Membership of the Commission confers powers of patronage.

Shri V.P. Nayar : We are functioning in so many Commissions. In the Delimitation Commission which is a very important Commission there are Members of Parliament. In all other commissions, we have Members of Parliament. Why exclude this? Is it because no Member of Parliament, however eminent he may be in the field of education, is competent to be a Member of the Commission? If that is the case, I have no argument.

From the other amendments which I have tabled, you will find that I have suggested that the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Secretary should be whole-time officers. In that context, this becomes relevant also. I would go to the extent of giving nomination to a member of the Inter-university Board if there is an effective organisation like that. My object is to see that really and truly this Commission should function as a body independent of the Government and independent from the secretariat of the Government. They cannot put strings and make one member Vice-Chancellor agree to that. Another Vice-Chancellor Mr. B. will point out this. There is also this danger. I have also suggested that the Commission should elect its Chairman. The reason is very simple. Supposing my friend happens to be the Chairman of this Commission, it is very natural, it is a human weakness that he will have a partiality for his own University. Is it not ? Supposing for example, the Vice-Chancellor of Benaras University happens to be the Chairman, if a proposal is made for certain grants being enhanced to the Benaras University, he being the executive chief of the Commission will necessarily have a human weakness which we want to avoid. The Government may nominate one Vice-Chancellor as the Chairman. We want to avoid such contingencies. We want to ensure that the members who are selected, among whom are also celebrated Vice-Chancellors, should be given the power to elect their Chairman. I think these are not very revolutionary amendments. There are just ordinary, amendments which my hon. friend the Deputy Minister for Education can very easily understand. I submit that these amendments will certainly make this Commission function a little more effectively, and a little more to the satisfaction of the people. We have an immense problem to tackle. I do not diminish its importance. The question is whether by this we can create in the tens and thousands of our teachers and students a feeling that the Government of India are having a new approach and that the Government of India will not continue the old approach of preserving our education in the colonial pattern and that they are going to entrust competent people with the Job of reorienting our University education.

I believe that the Government will cast away its moorings and try to accept some of these amendments which will be found to have a very good effect on this Commission, and which will raise the Commission in status, especially in the minds of the people.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : According to the scheme suggested by the Bill, the University Grants Commission would consist of 9 members, 3 from among the Vice-Chancellors, 2 from the departments and the remaining from among persons with academic distinctions. I have proposed 12 instead of 9.

Shri V.P. Nayar : I suppose you have no objection to 17?

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : Of course, in dealing with numbers, one has to be arbitrary. I feel that even the suggestion of the Government, nine, has also been arbitrarily decided. Which is the best number is a matter that has to be decided by this hon. House. According to Radhakrishnan Commission's report, it is suggested that 5 would be the best. They have also said that it should not, in any case, exceed 7. Even there they have just taken an arbitrary decision. It has to be arbitrary by its very nature. We have to see which number is the best.

The reason why I have moved this amendment is this. This Commission is entrusted with two broad functions. One has to decide the question of grants to the various Universities whose numbers are very many. I think the number of Universities is more than 30. Secondly, its task is to co-ordinate and maintain and determine standards of University education. The function and responsibilities entrusted to this Commission are very many. Therefore, I feel that the number that is to be suggested for this Commission should neither be too big nor too small. The hon. Minister may say that nine is quite adequate. My hon. friend Shri V.P. Nayar has suggested, and Dr. Saha has also suggested that the number should be increased to more than a dozen. But I have taken a *via media* line, and I have suggested a medium-sized membership, and I would request the hon. Members of this House to agree to this amendment.

By another amendment I have suggested that two Members of Parliament should be Members of this Commission. My hon. friend who spoke just now made a point that there are people in this House and the other House who are as competent as any others outside who could serve effectively on this Commission.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar : They are not barred.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy : Of course, under sub-clause (c) Members of Parliament may be included, but my amendment makes

the position clear and it gives a definite number to the Houses of Parliament, and I expect that the hon. Minister would agree to my suggestion, and I hope that all the hon. Members here would endorse my suggestion.

There is one thing more I must say that is that the composition of the Commission should be such that there should not be too much of official element in it. I have not altered the number as suggested in the Bill. I agree with that number. Only two members should be drawn from the departments of the Government. One may be from the Finance department and another from the Education department, and it should not be more than two. The non-official element should be very predominant.

So, I would request the hon. Minister and my colleagues to accept my amendment, and I feel my scheme of things is much better than what is proposed in the Bill.

Shri Matthen : My amendment is very simple. In line 29, instead of "not less than three members from among the Vice-Chancellors" I want it to be "not more than three members."

I want to make it very clear that I have the greatest respect for the Vice-Chancellors, several of whom are personal friends of mine. I have very great respect for them, almost all of them except perhaps one for whom I am sure no responsible person in India including the hon. Minister for Education will give a character certificate. I hope that such notorious characters will be avoided.

My point is that the Vice-Chancellors should not be here on the Commission because they are interested parties. they are interested parties in being the principal applicants for the grants.

The Parliamentary Secretary mentioned at the beginning of his speech that the U.K. Commission is an ideal one. He meant, I believe, that it would be a model for him and his Ministry also. The only reason why they should not be there it is because as Dr. Saha said yesterday, however honest and good they may be, they are human. Secondly, there is an Inter-University Board. If the Commission want to make any reference, they can very well ask them. There is no dearth of Vice-Chancellors. Advice is available.

I shall be glad if all the three are avoided, but, at any rate, if it is "not less than three," they can make it more. I do not want even one more than three.

Shri V.P. Nayar : Would the hon. Member lay it down that Vice-

Chancellors so selected should be men of unquestionable integrity and of very sound character ?

Shri Matthen : I say they should not be notorious characters. That is all. It is a very difficult question otherwise about character.

The most embarrassing thing is about the secretariat of the Commission – the Secretariat appointed by the Commission. Suppose, for example, as the Aligarh University, some note about the University's irregularities has to be written and that they do not deserve a grant; if the Vice-Chancellor is on the Commission, it would be very embarrassing for the Secretary to write anything against the University concerned.

I think now there are four Vice-Chancellors on the Commission. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary may correct me if I am wrong. Three of them are of Central universities. Out of nearly Rs. 5 crores grants that is distributed, more than half is given to four Central universities, rather I would say three, I do not think Vishwa-Bharati getting much.

Dr. M.M. Das: They are getting maintenance grants directly from the Centre, so far as development grants are concerned, the University Grants Commission is giving them.

Shri Matthen : At least half the grant is being distributed to three Central universities, and three of the Vice-Chancellors are on the Commission. If there are three it does not matter. My point is when I say "not more than" I would also add "at least not more than one from the Central Universities", – Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, or Dr. Matthai, anybody for that matter is different. After all, that university will get only 1/70.

That is the only object. Interested parties to be the deciding body will be like the client being the judge, and it would be extremely unfair. If, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary said the U.K. Commission is the ideal one, I cannot understand why he does not follow this. In fact, a very eminent educationist of the United Kingdom – I do not mention the name – said about this Bill that the Government is committing a cardinal blunder by keeping the Vice-Chancellors on the Commission. The words are not mine, I am only quoting.

So, I hope as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary said, if he wants respect, fairness, objectivity, if he expects an efficient, honest secretariat, he would not exceed the number three, and not have many Central universities' Vice-Chancellors.

Shri D.C. Sharma : *rose* –

Mr. Chairman: May I just inform him that I promise to finish this clause at 5. He may kindly be brief.

Shri D.C. Sharma : I fail to understand what kind of authority the Ministry of Education wants to bring into being by acting upon clause 12. Do they want a deliberate body ? If they want this. They have got a body like the Inter-University Board, or the All-India Council for Secondary Education. That is the pattern for them. Do they want an executive body? Then surely I say this is not the pattern for an executive body. I think the right pattern for an executive body has been given in the University Education Commission's Report. Why have they deviated from that? I cannot understand that. I think that if they have deviated from the University Education Commission's Report, they have done so to the detriment of university education in this country. I think this body should consist of persons who have to have a kind of judicial authority. It should be a body which should have the title of judicial-mindedness attached to it.

Three Vice-Chancellors are going to be on it. Our Ministry of Education is going to create a new class of super Vice-Chancellors. They will be super Vice-Chancellors because they will be in a position to give money to everybody. A very wise man has said – I do not mention his name – that nobody who has money to distribute ever omits himself. If a Vice-Chancellor is going to distribute money, I do not think he will forget, being human just like you and me, his own university, or his own case or his own interest. I therefore think that the most grievous blunder that the Ministry of Education is going to make is this, namely that they are going to have three Vice-Chancellors on this body. And what will these Vice-Chancellors do ? I need not go into the arguments which have been advanced in this connection by so many friends of mine already. My hon. friend Shri Matthen said that he liked and respected all Vice-Chancellors excepting one. So far as I am concerned, I respect all Vice-Chancellors. I respect even that Vice-Chancellor in whose case he made an exception. But surely I do not want them on this Commission. They have their place somewhere else.

So far as sub-clause (2) (b) of clause 5 is concerned, I have no objection to it. Let there be two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government. So far as sub-clause (2) (c) is concerned, it is provided that educationists of repute will also be on this Commission. But we do not know who an educationist of repute is. For instance, the headmaster of a school can be an educationist of repute, or the principal of a girls' *mahavidyalaya* can be an educationist of repute. But that is not the type of persons that we want. We want this Commission to be a body of experts, who will be able

to sit in judgment over various proposals, and will also be able to outline the policy of Government so far as educational development is concerned, for he who pays the piper calls for the tune. The University Grants Commission is now going to lay down the policy in regard to educational development in the university field. I therefore think that these vague phrases like 'educationist of repute' will not carry us very far. I would say that there should be only seven members on this Commission. The Chairman should be a whole-time person. To this, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary has already agreed. Then, there should be two members to represent the Central Government. The remaining four persons should be persons of international reputation, who have won their laurels not merely in South India or North India or Punjab, but who are persons known all over the country and abroad for their eminence in the field of education, scholarship and learning. Otherwise, I feel that this Commission will only create a great deal of scramble amongst the different persons.

Of course, to tell you the plain truth, I am not opposed to the principle of election at all. Some of my hon. friends have not agreed to the principle of election. They themselves have been elected to the House, and yet they speak against the principle of election. I do not know now they can do so. I am out and out for the principle of election, and I would not mind at all if all these persons are elected.

But if you do not want to have elections, then at least give us a body of experts, which will be homogeneous in character, and harmonious in outlook, which will not be too unwieldy and which will not also be a conglomeration of conflicting interests or an aggregate of those persons who are themselves involved in getting some money from the Commission. I would say: Let not this Commission be known by its lack of integrity. The moment you bring in Vice-Chancellors, people will begin to say, this is a kind of body where one man helps the other, or the right hand is helping the left hand. I do not want that kind of remark to be made about this Commission.

I would therefore request the hon. Minister to change the composition of the Commission, so that the University Grants Commission will be born under an auspicious star and my hon. friends like Shri V.P. Nayar will not be able to say that they can forecast the names of the persons who will be appointed to serve on this body. I want that this body should never have that kind of a stigma attached to it.

The House will be rising for today in just a few minutes, and I would request the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to think over the matter,

consult his colleagues, and then come tomorrow with the proposal that the composition of the Commission will be as the Members of the House have desired.

Shri K. K. Basu : As the time is short, I shall be very brief in my remarks. I want to draw the attention of the House to only one aspect, and that is regarding the appointment of the Commission by election. I have tabled some amendments in this regard. By my first amendment, I have sought to increase the number to 15 of whom 5 shall be Vice-Chancellors to be elected from among themselves; 8 shall be persons who are eminent in the field of education in the different branches, — of these 8, 4 will be elected by Members of Parliament and the other 4 will be elected by electoral colleges or whatever they may be. We have in our country today about 30 to 35 Vice-Chancellors, and they could easily elect five from among themselves to serve on this Commission. It is said that election will create bickering among the Vice-Chancellors. But I do not think that the Vice-Chancellors who were supposed to be persons of great eminence in the field of education, and who are in-charge of the education of a large section of the future citizens of India and possibly also of the future parliamentarians and the future Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries of the Government of India who are going to lay down the policies, will stoop so low as to have bickerings and quarrels among themselves. We know from experience that the Ministers are more or less just signing machines; they simply put a rubber-stamp on the decisions made by the administration. That being the position, I do not want that the Vice-Chancellors should be appointed by government. It is true that there may be persons in the administration who are interested in the field of education, but on the whole, our administration is just a continuance of the old administration consisting of the I.C.S. people and their successors, the I.A.S. people. I therefore feel that it should not be left to Government to nominate the Vice-Chancellors.

There is no point in saying that there will be too much bickerings if there is election. When we are asking the Vice-Chancellors to be in charge of universities where large sums of money are involved and where the education of so many students is involved, I do not think that if they are asked to have an election from amongst themselves, they will stoop so low as to indulge in politics or bickerings or things of that sort.

I have suggested also that there should be eight persons who should be men of eminence in the field of education in the different branches, such as technology, humanities, classics and so on. Of these eight, half

the number should be nominated by special method and the other half should be elected by Members of Parliament. As you, Sir, are aware, I happen to be a member of a committee of which you are the Chairman. You have suggested therein that Members of Parliament should not be elected to serve on bodies such as this. But I personally do not subscribe to that view, because in our country as democratic institutions take stronger roots, Members of Parliament each will have to devote their whole time to the service of the seven and a half lakhs of voters who elect them to that honourable position. So, it is not possible for Members of Parliament to serve on this Commission. But they can elect others to serve on it. I feel that there should not be any nomination by Government at all, so far as the appointment of persons of eminence is concerned. For, somebody in the administration may feel that X or Y or Z is an eminent man therefore he should be nominated, but in reality, that man may not really be an eminent man. Some of my hon. friends have already stated their experience in this connection and pointed out that sometimes the persons who are appointed as Vice-Chancellors do not deserve to be in that honourable position. My hon. friend Shri V.P. Nayar has suggested that persons who take little or no interest in the university, or persons who are in bad repute, should not be chosen as Vice-Chancellors.

I feel therefore that this sovereign Parliament should have a say in the matter. At least a certain percentage of the members of the Commission should be elected by Parliament. Otherwise what will happen is this. Government will nominate their own persons, and once they are nominated, they will continue for a period of six years and we shall have no say in the matter. But if Members of Parliament have a say in the matter they will be able to do justice to the regional viewpoints, about which there has been so much of discussion in this House.

There is nothing wrong in having election of a certain percentage of the members. After all, how is the Vice-Chancellor of a university appointed ? A panel of three or four names is elected, and the Chancellor of the university, who generally happens to be the head of the State nominates one person from that panel. So, the argument that the question of bringing in election in regard to the Vice-Chancellor members of the Commission will affect the morale of the Vice-Chancellors does not hold water. I would go a step further and say that the Chairman of the Commission should also be an elected person, and he should not be nominated by Government. We expect eminent men of our country to come into this body. Do we think that nine or ten or

fifteen persons will not be in a position to elect the correct person to be their Chairman ? Therefore, it should be left to that body to elect its own Chairman; it should not be left to the Government. That is the only point I want to urge upon Government.

Dr. M. M. Das : I have heard with great interest the suggestions put forward by hon. Members. When I was listening to their speeches, I was reminded of a story in the Aesop's Fables which I read in my childhood days.

Shri V. P. Nayar : How do you spell Aesop ?

Dr. M.M. Das : The moral of the story is this : he who tries to please everybody pleases none. I find myself in a most unenviable position. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Chairman : Why does he try to please anybody ? Let him look at the merits of the case and decide.

Dr. M.M. Das : Every Member has his own plan, his own scheme. Different speakers have put forward their suggestions; each one of them has got a different scheme as to how the composition will take place. Moreover, if you go through the Minutes of Dissent, you will find suggestions coming from the Members of the Joint Committee also. Shri H.N. Mukerjee says that there should be 17 members, of which 10 should be elected by the research workers and teachers of Universities and so on. Shri Meghnad Saha has got his own scheme. Every one of the hon. Members who has preceded me just now has got his own scheme.

An Hon. Member : You have your own ?

Shri V.P. Nayar: The only person who has not a scheme is yourself.

Dr. M.M. Das: In my bewilderment, I prefer to accept the suggestion made by the Joint Committee.

As regards the different amendments that have been moved to this clause, Government propose to accept only one, that is, amendment No. 2 of Shri K.C. Sodhia's. I do not know whether he has moved it.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I have moved it.

Dr. M.M. Das: The amendment reads like this:

Page 2, line 29 –

for "less" substitute "more".

Other amendments have been moved to the same effect, but his appears to be the first.

Mr. Chairman: So amendment No. 2 is accepted.

Dr. M.M. Das: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: I shall put the amendment to the vote of the House.

The question:

Page 2, line 29—

for “less” substitute “more”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 26 is the same as amendment No. 2 accepted by the House and is thus barred.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment No. 7.

The amendment was, by leave withdrawn

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put all the other amendments to clause 5 to the vote of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2 —

(i) line 26, *for “nine members” substitute*

“seventeen members”;

(ii) *after line 30, insert:*

“(aa) not less than four members representing the faculties of engineering, medicine and technology;”;

(iii) *for lines 33 to 35, substitute:*

“(c) four members from among persons of all India repute as educationists and with a minimum of fifteen years’ experience in the field of education:”; and

(iv) *after line 35, add:*

“(d) one member to be elected by the Inter-Varsity Board;

(e) two members to be elected by the members of Lok Sabha from among themselves; and

(f) one member to be elected by Rajya Sabha from among themselves;”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 29—

omit “not” less than”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 29 —

for “three members” *substitute* “five members”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 30—

add at the end:

“to be elected by the Vice-Chancellors themselves”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 31—

for “two members” *substitute* “one member”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 33—

after “the remaining number” *insert* “of whom at least one shall be a woman”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chariman: The question is:

Page 2, line 35—

add at the end:

“half of such members shall be elected by the members of Parliament and the other half to be elected by the Syndicates or the Executive Councils of the different Universities.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2—

(i) line 36,—

for “not less than one-half” *substitute* “not more than one-fourth”;
and

(ii) line 37,—

omit “not”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 3, —

for lines 1 to 3, substitute:

“(3) The Commission shall elect from among its members a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman and a Secretary.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 3, line 2 —

after “Commission” insert “on its recommendation”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 3, line 3—

after “State Government” insert:

“or the Vice-Chancellor of a University”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2, line 29—

for “three members” substitute “four members”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 2 —

after line 32, insert:

“(bb) two members from among the members of Parliament; and”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 25th November 1955.

Document No. 34

Further consideration of University Grants Commission Bill by the House of People dated 25-11-1955

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further clause by clause consideration of the University Grants Commission Bill. Out of 13 hours allotted for this Bill, about 10 hours have already been availed of till yesterday in the general discussion and the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. A balance of about 3 hours now remains. As one hour has been agreed to for the third reading of the Bill, the clause by clause consideration of the Bill will continue up to 2 P.M. today when the third reading will be taken up. At 2.30 P.M., the House will take up Private Members' Resolutions.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): We are beginning at 12.15

Mr. Speaker: Whatever it may be, we go up to 2.30

Clause 6 – Terms and conditions of service of members

Mr. Speaker: Clause 6. As regards the amendments, I am calling the names of hon. Members who have tabled amendments to this. Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: absent. That is amendment No. 39. Amendment No. 8 Shri Shree Narayan Das.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central): I beg to move:

Page 3, line 9—

for “six years” substitute “four years”.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment No. 40 is the same as amendment No. 8. It need not be called again. Amendment No. 41: Shri V.P. Nayar.

Shri V.P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): I beg to move:

Page 3 –

for lines 10 to 15 substitute:

“Provided that out of the members functioning in the Commission for the first time, as nearly as possible, one-third of the members shall retire as soon as may be on the expiry of the second year, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the regulations under this Act.”

Mr. Speaker: Amendment No. 42: not moving. Amendment No. 9: Shri Shree Narayan Das.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 21—

add at the end:

“and a member so appointed shall hold office for the remaining period for which the member in whose place he is appointed would have held office.”

Shri V.P. Nayar: I beg to move: Page 3 —

(i) line 22—

for “Chairman” *substitute* “Secretary”.

(ii) line 24 —

for “Chairman” *substitute* “Secretary”.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 22—

after “shall be a” *insert* “whole-time and”.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment No. 68 is the same as No. 10.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): No. 30.

Mr. Speaker: So, the following amendments are there: 8, 41, 9, 43 and 10. These are the amendments.

Shri Matthen: My amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Hon. Members must be careful to see that they are present when their number comes in. I called the names of the hon. Members and I also called the numbers.

Shri Matthen: I was here.

Mr. Speaker: But when I called it.....

Shri Matthen: My name was not called.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore) *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I called the name, I am quite sure about it, but in view of the fact that this is perhaps the first occasion I will say that I may permit them as a special case, but hereafter Members have to be careful to see that they remain present in the House. It is not as if they may come when they choose to come and say this amendment is there or that amendment is there. So, I am allowing both now. Shri Gurupadaswamy's amendment No. 39 and Shri Matthen's — what is the number?

Shri Matthen: 30, 33 and 38.

Mr. Speaker: What clause is he referring to? We are taking up clause 6.

Shri Matthen: Clause 5

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gugaon): Amendment Nos. 30, 33 and 38 have been disposed of yesterday.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 9,—

for “six years” substitute “three years”.

Mr. Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: My first amendment to clause 6 is No. 8 which reads as follows:

Page 3 line 9—

for “six years” substitute “four years”.

Sub-clause (1) of clause 6 reads:

“Every member shall, unless he becomes disqualified for continuing as such under the rules that may be made under this Act, hold office for a period of six years.”

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The simple purpose of the amendment is that the term of office or the period should be four years instead of six years. I think six years is a very long time for a person to continue as a member of this Commission. I suggest that instead of six years this be made four years so that fresh talent may be given an opportunity to work on this Commission. Otherwise, the work may not proceed as it should.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: My amendment is a very simple one, and it says:

Page 3, line 22 —

after “shall be a” insert “whole-time and”.

The original clause was that a whole-time officer must be appointed, but it seems to me that somehow we have omitted the word “whole-time”. Today the Bill says it must be only a salaried officer. In the British University Grants Commission there are more than one whole-time officers and if I remember aright, there are three or four. Perhaps the work in India does not warrant the appointment of many whole-time officers, but as the work progresses it may be necessary for this

Commission also to appoint more than one whole-time officer. But we think that at least the Chairman should be a whole-time salaried officer. I feel that it is absolutely essential for the good working of this Commission that at least the Chairman should be a full-time officer. The word "salaried" is there, but "whole-time" is not there. I wish to make it "a whole-time and salaried" officer. That is the amendment.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: My amendment is very simple and says that the period of membership in the Commission should not be six years, and instead should be only three years.

The simple reason why I have suggested this amendment is that if you give too long a period of membership in the Commission there is one danger, that it may be very difficult for the Government during that period to terminate the period of membership unless they become disqualified during that period. And once you appoint the Commission you have to keep quiet, and whether they do their work well or not, you have to put up with it. There is no other alternative.

We know how the Union Public Service Commission and other Public Service Commissions are working. The period given to them is long enough, but they are statutory bodies. They are bodies constituted under the provisions of the Constitution and the period also is fixed. The age limit is fixed. But due to the long period given to the Public Service Commissions we have been faced with certain difficulties. One difficulty is that though certain members of the Public Service Commission are incompetent, or are proved incompetent during the course of work, the Government has no alternative to change the membership or the composition of the Commission. So, they have to wait till the whole period is over. So, I feel a shorter period will be better and it will be in conformity.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. There are statutory bodies as the hon. Member observed – the Public Service Commission, other commissions, the Election Commission, High Courts, the Supreme Court. Now, is it right for the hon. Member to say indirectly that some of them have proved incompetent and we are helpless?

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: They are human.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not right. They can be impeached and sent out only in a particular manner. Therefore, to put forward such an argument as if it is admitted is not right. Is it open to the hon. Member to say that some of the Judges have been appointed and they have proved incompetent, we are unable to remove them?

Shri V.P. Nayar: Why not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not right by way of analogy to bring in such an argument. So far as those high dignitaries are concerned, indirectly you cannot say: "This Judge has proved incompetent, remove him." It is not right. One can easily bring in the analogy of others and say that the Government is incompetent, everybody is incompetent, and therefore have one year or three years. Is this an occasion for just going into the conduct or the affairs of any particular statutory body, as if it is admitted and it has been proved, the guilt has been established and somebody has been dismissed or impeached. The other side can say: "No, no. It is wrong". Aspersions ought not to be cast. So far as statutory bodies are concerned, there is a particular way in which their administration could be brought before the House. They could be removed, punished for misconduct and so on. But indirectly it is not right to draw them here by way of analogy as if their guilt and incompetence is established. The hon. Member can say certainly that three years is better since six years is too long, but not quote some other as if it has been established.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: My point is not to cast any slur or aspersion against the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. It is not right. Hon. Member has already said that some of them have proved to be incompetent. Where have they proved to be incompetent?

Shri V.P. Nayar: He said only Public Service Commission. He did not refer to either the State Public Service Commission or the Union Public Service Commission.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where is the Public Service Commission? In the air? In the United Kingdom?

Shri V.P. Nayar: There are so many.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If it is the Union Public Service Commission there is a procedure. If it is that of a State we have no jurisdiction. In either case he is in the wrong.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: I do not want to pursue that matter. I thought that would be a case and justification for my argument.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Absolutely not.

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: Because you took exception to it, I do not want to pursue this matter. My simple suggestion is that it would be better in the context of things that we fix a lower period, a short period for the Commission. The provision made in the Bill is six years which is too long a period, and I would appeal to the hon. Members of this

House to consider this matter in a dispassionate spirit, and appeal to them again that my amendment may be accepted.

Shri V.P. Nayar: My amendment is amendment No. 41, wherein I have suggested that instead of the first batch of one-half of the members retiring at the end of the third year, one-third of the members may retire at the end of the second year. In substance that is what my amendment seeks to provide. But I want to say something as to why I have tabled this amendment.

As far as we are concerned, there is nothing in the Bill to guarantee that the proper persons will be selected for this Commission, because it is to consist of persons who will be nominated by Government on certain terms which have been kept very beautifully vague.

Shri T.N. Singh: (Banaras Distt.— East): Vagueness is always beautiful.

Shri V.P. Nayar: We find that there are going to be three Vice-Chancellors nominated by Government. I do not want to refer to any institution or to any name; I do not want to refer also to any particular Vice-Chancellor of this university or that university. But from the records available with the Government of India it will be found that there are Vice-Chancellors, who, for instance, at the time when India was declaring her independence, had declared their independence and sought to take up arms against the Government, and had even gone to the extent of trying to send plenipotentiaries and ambassadors to foreign countries like France and Belgium. There happen to be some Vice-Chancellors like that. There also happen to be a few Vice-Chancellors, who, as I said yesterday when you were not present in the House, are having two whole-time jobs. For example, the Vice-Chancellor of a university may be taking up a full-time job elsewhere also. As I was pointing out yesterday, there are certain Vice-Chancellors in the Parliament also. You yourself would find very little time for any activity outside the Parliament, but there happen to be Vice-Chancellors who are Members of Parliament.

So, my amendment seeks to reduce at least the period of office of the retiring members. So long as we know that in this body,— however laudable the personal intentions of Dr. M.M. Das may be,— constituted as it is, the selection is going to be in some cases at least, of very wrong persons who ought not to find a place therein, and who ought to have been kicked out from everything connected with Government a long time ago. If the period at least is reduced from three to two years, we

would be choosing a lesser evil. The evil is there anyway. I do not doubt it all. But if, as I suggest, one-third of the members retire at the end of every second year, I for one believe that there will be a lesser impact of the evil which will necessarily come out of the wrong selection which is bound to be made by Government.

There is also one other small point in regard to this matter. In the proviso to sub-clause (1) of clause 6, we find the phrase:

“.....in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed.....”.

The word ‘prescribed’ as defined in the definition clause means ‘prescribed by rules made under this Act’. Here, I want to make a slight change. Instead of having the words ‘rules made under this Act’, Government may have the words ‘regulations made under this Act’. And I hope Government could possibly have no serious objection to this.

I therefore commend my amendment for the acceptance of Government. I can assure them that they also will be benefited if one-third of the members retire at the end of the second year, for they can find out more suitable and more competent men and substitute them in their place. Especially, in view of the present context, when everything is in a nebulous state and there is no fixed thought about the future of education, I would suggest accepting the amendment. Let us try to choose the members only for a period of two years.

Shri D.C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): I know that the speeches that we are making in regard to amending this Bill are going to be a cry in the wilderness. All the same, I would submit that the term of six years is too long, and will not conduce to the efficient working of this great body. As has already been suggested by some of my hon. friends, the term should be only four years. I cannot understand by what kind of arithmetic, by what kind of logic or by what kind of educational foresight, the term of six years has been arrived at. Even five years would have been a very good term. In this case, I think, four years would be enough, for if it is more than four years, then the Commission will become a body of vested interests, especially when there is no principle of election at work. That is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion is that it is not necessary that you should retire one-half of the members at the end of three years. I think you should take into account the fact that there are only nine members, of whom one is the Chairman. I would suggest that about one-third of the

members should retire after the expiry of two years, assuming the term is four years.

Again, I would say that the Chairman of the Commission should be a whole-time man. I do not know if the hon. Parliamentary Secretary agreed to this suggestion yesterday.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): I have made it plain in my speech about this point.

Shri D.C. Sharma: My feeling is that if he has not agreed to it already, he should agree to it at least now, and see that the Chairman is a whole-time salaried man. I would also say that the terms and conditions of service of the Chairman and other members should be defined under the rules. I hope they will be defined under the rules, and they will be placed on the Table of the House.

My main point is that the term of six years is too long, and it would lead to the stereotyping of the methods and the approach of the Commission. That is something which we have to avoid.

Dr. M.M. Das: I am sorry I cannot accept amendment No. 8 of my hon. friend Shri Shree Narayan Das, which says that instead of six years, the term of office of the members will be four years. My hon. friend's argument is that new talents should be allowed to come in. But our concern is the continuity of experience in this matter. So, all the amendments, the purport of which is to lessen the period of office.....

Shri V.P. Nayar: If that is the point, then why not make it permanent and say that a member will be there until he dies? In that case, he could have more continuity.

Dr. M.M. Das: I am sorry I cannot agree to the suggestions of hon. Members in this regard, and therefore, I cannot accept those amendments.

So far as amendment No. 9 is concerned, we are going to accept it. As for this amendment, it seeks to make only a verbal change.

So far as amendment No. 10 tabled by Shri T.S.A. Chettiar is concerned, I have already stated in my speech that Government are accepting it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What number?

Dr. M.M. Das: We accept amendments Nos. 9 and 10.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 3, line 9—

for “six years” substitute “four years”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 21—

add at the end:

“and a member so appointed shall hold office for the remaining period for which the member in whose place he is appointed would have held office”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 22 —

after “shall be a” insert “whole-time and”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3, line 9 —

for “six years” substitute:

“three years”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Page 3 —

for lines 10 to 15 substitute:

“provided that out of the members functioning in the Commission for the first time, as nearly as possible, one-third of the members shall retire as soon as may be on the expiry of the second year, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the regulations under this Act.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put clause 6, as amended, to the vote of the House.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West): I wish to speak on sub-clause (4) of clause 6.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We did not take up any particular sub-clause separately. I placed all the amendments to the sub-clauses and the clause before the House. Then the hon. Member might have taken an

opportunity to speak. If only he had stood up then, I would have allowed him to speak. Hereafter, let this be the practice. Unless there is any sub-clause of a clause which is of such great importance and there are a number of amendments moved to it and therefore, it should be taken up separately, I will allow all the amendments to all the sub-clauses or the clause to be moved together and once for all put them to the vote of the House. This will speed up the discussion. Since Shri Meghnad Saha has not spoken already on this and wants to speak now, I have no objection to allowing him to speak.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): He wanted to speak on the entire clause with special reference to sub-clause (4).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He could have done that earlier. I did not want to prevent him from speaking. Anyway, I will allow him to participate now.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: He was under the impression that after the amendments are disposed of, general discussion on the clause itself would start.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: For the benefit of all Members, and lest there be any misunderstanding about this matter, I propose following this procedure. With respect to the clauses, a clause will be taken up. All amendments to the clause, — except where an hon. Member says that a particular sub-clause is of such great importance and there are a number of amendments to it that it should be taken up first separately and disposed of, in which case I will take it up first and then go to the other sub-clauses, — will be moved together and disposed of together. I think that will give an opportunity for all to speak.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Sub-clause (4) says:

“The office of the Chairman shall be a salaried one and subject thereto, the terms and conditions of service of the Chairman and other members shall be such as may be prescribed.”

I considered that this sub-clause is very vague.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It was to this sub-clause that Shri T.S.A. Chettiar moved an amendment that the office of the Chairman should be whole-time.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I understand that the Government have accepted the suggestion that the office of the Chairman should be a whole-time one, and salaried one. Is that correct or not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That was what he said.

Dr. M.M. Das: The office of the Chairman will be full-time. In my reply, I had indicated that Government were going to accept that amendment. Now, that amendment has been accepted.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I am glad the Government have accepted the suggestion that the Chairman should be a whole-time salaried officer and he should be the principal executive officer of the University Grants Commission.

Then there is a phrase "and other members shall be such as may be prescribed". We do not say what other members we require. I think it should be stated in the Bill what other members you require; and of what status they ought to be and what salaries should be given to them, that may be decided by the rules. But I think, as it stands, this clause is extremely vague. I suggest that in place of this you should have something more definite.

I am returning to a suggestion which I already made. The functions of the University Grants Commission are described in clause 12. If you read through that clause, you will find that it prescribes for the University Grants Commission a host of duties. And the Bill nowhere says how these duties are going to be carried out. You have to study the state of education in the Universities in different branches.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think it is not relevant to this clause. We are not on clause 12 now.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I am referring to clause 12 in connection with my speech on sub-clause (4) of clause 6. Here in sub-clause (4) it is said: "other members that may be prescribed". But what are the other members? Who shall prescribe? This is very vague. This does not give any direction to the rule-making body and, therefore, we should try to elucidate it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Here the terms and conditions of service are to be prescribed. 'Prescribed' applies to terms and conditions of service.

Shri Meghnad Saha: By whom and in what way?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: By rules under the Act.

Shri Meghnad Saha: In order to give some guidance in framing the rules, I have stood up. If you want the University Grants Commission really to do work, it will not only have to be an official body, but it will have to be a body which will have to study all aspects of education in this country – such aspects of education which are covered by university education. It will be a body which will be continuously studying all

aspects of education in this country. The University generally carries on higher teaching work in science, in arts, in humanities, in medicine etc.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That relates to functions of the Commission. The terms and conditions of services of whosoever is appointed is one and the functions and duties of the Commission is another. I understand the hon. Member to say that it ought not to be a merely co-ordinating or inspecting body but it should have, as he suggested, some other members who are qualified as scientists and so on. That is what he has in view. He wants to give effect to that by introducing suitable provisions in some clause of the Bill. But, this does not seem to be the appropriate place.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: If I may point out, there is no specific amendment to this clause, saying that there must be some other members who must be full-time servants. But the point of Dr. Saha is that considering the work of the Commission, some more members will have to be appointed full-time, and that he wants to do by sub-clause (4). It does not bar other full-time people being appointed. It only says that the Chairman should be full-time. It also says that the terms and conditions of service of the Chairman and other members shall be such as may be prescribed. They may be prescribed by rules. The rules may provide that some of the other members can also be full-time. He seeks to bring it to the notice of Government that when it comes to the matter of framing the rules they should say that when it is necessary some members may be appointed full-time. He wants that they should say that they would appoint some more members full-time in view of the work of the Commission under clause 12. That seems to be the idea of the distinguished Doctor and that requires consideration from the Government.

Shri Meghnad Saha: I think Mr. Chettiar has explained the point very finely and I have nothing to add to that except that I should say that it should state what should be the qualifications of these members.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: That will also come under the rules.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yesterday, we discussed clause 5 and there was an amendment by Dr. Saha to that clause. But that clause was disposed of at the fag end of the day in the absence of Dr. Saha. As a matter of fact, the reply given by the hon. Minister was not quite satisfactory. He only stated that, as a matter of fact, the Government wanted to have only one whole-time man and wanted to pay him as they pleased. So far as payment and conditions and terms of service are

concerned, they arise incidentally. If there are many whole-time paid people and experts as suggested by Dr. Saha, it is quite clear that they shall have to be paid on the same scale as the chief man because they will all be of equal rank and they will be doing executive work. Where the difference arises between those who think like Dr. Saha – for instance, myself – and the hon. Minister is this. We want that this should be an executive body and should consist of a Chairman and at least 4 experts and other people who will do executive work. They will roam about and find out what are the necessities in the country and then those persons will do something so far as higher education is concerned. Whereas the idea of Government seems to be that there will be one Chairman and 8 or 9 other people, 3 Vice-Chancellors and so on who will sit round a table like ordinary directors in a company and will not do any executive work. They will transact whatever business is placed before them by the office. There was one redeeming feature and that was the hon. Minister said yesterday that after getting some experience they will consider the suggestions of Dr. Saha. According to me and Dr. Saha no experience need be gained. If you mean business then appoint such people who will do the work assigned to them under clause 12. The Government is not accepting that. What is the use in mincing matters? If you do not select the proper men, how will it serve the country if the conditions and terms of service are favourable to their capacity, authority, or otherwise. We want such people to be fully capable of delivering goods in whose hands the destinies of the country will be placed. As a matter of fact, they will be persons who will do much executive work. Government's idea of the Grants Commission is absolutely different from what Dr. Saha thinks and I think it is a question of principle. If Government mean business they should have more whole-time people, say 4 or 5 at least. When we discussed this yesterday in connection with clause 5, the suggestion was not accepted. Now, all that we can do is to cut out some of the matters mentioned in clause 12 and make the Commission a debating society and not an executive body which will do something good to the country. I do not know how to incorporate Dr. Saha's suggestions at this stage even if the hon. Minister agreed to do so. He will have to bring in some amendment and see that clause 5 is changed if he means business. We are not as much concerned with the terms and conditions of service as with the functions, as you have been pleased to remark. The Government's idea is that they will not behave in the manner in which Dr. Saha wants them to behave. Therefore, I would respectfully submit that, according to Dr.

Saha and some Members of this House who think like him, the Government must change their entire outlook so far as the work is concerned. According to clause 12, these persons have been charged with a very high duty and unless that duty is done in a proper manner it is useless to have this Commission at all.

Shri Meghnad Saha: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has clearly stated the point. I would like to go further and say this. There is need for more engineers and technicians in this country. The standard of the Universities in engineering and technology is very low. Engineering has so many branches today. Twenty-five years ago, there was no communications engineering, no radio engineering.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. Now, with all respect, I think it is foreign to the scope of this particular clause or even sub-clause (4). With regard to the terms and conditions of service, there is no intention to say it shall be Rs. 3,000, Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 or how long they will work. So far as qualifications and functions are concerned, they are in clause 12. Some suggestion has been made. The Government feels that this would restrict the scope of the Commission. There are various items mentioned by Dr. Radha Kumud Mukerjee in his minute of dissent; the important things for which the amount should be distributed and so on. If that is to be undertaken they will think of adding some Professors and others. All that I can say is that whatever has to be said has been said on clause 5 and the House voted against it. When we come to clause 12, if functions are imposed on the Commission they will be obliged to appoint other members from among the categories of persons mentioned in clause 5. There will be enough opportunity for the hon. Member in discussing clause 12 and not now. There is no use pursuing the matter further.

Now, there is one amendment of Shri V.P. Nayar, which has not been put to the House.

The question is:

Page 3 –

(i) line 22 –

for “Chairman” substitute “Secretary”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the question is:

“That clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 7 to 11 were added to the Bill.

Clause 12 – (Functions of the Commission)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What are the amendments to this clause? Is Government moving its amendment No. 69?

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: Government amendment is No. 1.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me have a list of all those amendments which hon. Members want to move and then I will give opportunity for hon. Members to move them.

Shri Ramachandra Reddy: Regarding the admissibility of amendment No.1, I have to raise a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will come to it later.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: My amendment is No. 12.

Shri K.C. Sodhia (Sagar): My amendment is No. 3.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I wish to move No. 13 in some amended form and also No. 70 and No. 11.

Shri B.K. Das (Contai): My amendment is No. 46. I have also another amendment No. 71, notice of which I have given today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the Government accepting it? I am not willing to admit an amendment which is sprung up on this House like this unless the Mover of the Bill is willing to accept it. Then it is placed before the House under those exceptional circumstances. Once bitten twice shy. Last time I gave permission to Dr. Lanka Sundaram to move his amendment and I know what happened. Hereafter no permission will be given by me whatever others may do. Does the hon. Minister accept Shri B.K. Das's amendment No. 71?

Dr. M.M. Das: Government is willing to accept amendment No.71.

Shri V.P. Nayyar: My amendment is No. 69.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will take up these amendments along with clause 12 and discussion will proceed on these amendments, on all the sub-clauses and on the clause as a whole. Ultimately the amendments will be put to the vote of the House. If any hon. Member wants any particular sub-clause to be put separately from the other sub-clauses, I have no objection, and in the end the clause as amended or not amended will be put to the House. That is the procedure.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Would you please permit me to move my amendment No. 13 in some slightly different form?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When he is allowed to stand up and move his amendment, we will think of that.

Let amendment No. 1 be moved now.

Dr. M.M. Das: I beg to move:

Page 4 –

for lines 23 to 29, substitute:

“(b) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities established or incorporated by or under a Central Act for the maintenance and development of such Universities or for any other general or specified purpose;

(bb) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, such grants to other Universities as it may deem necessary for the development of such Universities or for any other general or specified purpose:

Provided that in making any grant to any such University, the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the University concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purposes which it may serve.”

The provision is the same as it exists in the Bill. May I speak on this amendment, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the objection? A point of order is raised and so I am merely asking for a statement of facts.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: A substantially identical amendment was brought forward before the Joint Committee and the Chairman of the Committee ruled it out as beyond the scope of the Bill itself. On page 25 of the Joint Committee Report, we find:

“A Government amendment proposing a new sub-clause (b) in substitution of the existing sub-clause was ruled out of order by the Chairman inasmuch as the same provided for grants to be made by the University Grants Commission for the maintenance of Universities established under a Central Act. The amendment was considered to be beyond the scope of the Bill.”

The Bill in the preamble suggests only to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities. The same

thing was followed by the Joint Committee also and the Committee repeated the same thing, namely, "to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose,...." But now Government wants to include the maintenance also under this Act – the maintenance of Universities that have been established or incorporated by or under a Central Act. The original Bill and the Bill as it emerged out of the Joint Committee were specific in their view that the amount of money that is already spent by the Central Government to maintain some of those Universities that are centrally administered should not be covered by this Bill. Now maintenance grants are not being given or going to be given to any University and the Bill did not contemplate maintenance grants to be given to these four or five Universities that are administered by the Centre. So, this is a new idea and it should not be brought by way of an amendment into this Bill.

As regards the merits of the case, I will take it up later.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If I understand him correctly, what he says is that the centrally administered Universities established at Banaras, Delhi, Aligarh and Viswa Bharati do not come within the scope of the existing Bill. Is it so?

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it not for all the Universities established or incorporated by or under a Central Act or a Provincial Act? The definition of a University is....

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: The question of coordination and determination of standards only is considered in this Bill, not the maintenance of any University. If the Universities administered by the Centre can be maintained, then I think the State Universities also may have to be maintained at the cost of the Central Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If it is mere co-ordination, where does money come in?

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Money is given only for the purpose of co-ordination and determination of standards and not for the purpose of maintenance of any Universities.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What was the amendment that was ruled out?

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: The very same amendment.

Shri V.P. Nayar: The same amendment was brought by Government before the Joint Committee and was ruled out by the Chariman of the Committee there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On the ground that it is beyond the scope of the Bill?

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Yes, Sir. I would only refer you to page 25 of the Joint Committee Report, paragraph 3 of the minutes.

Dr. M.M. Das *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why is the hon. Member in a hurry? Let me hear the hon. Member who is in possession of the House now. I am not going to come to a conclusion without hearing the hon. Member who is in charge of the Bill.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: It is in paragraph 3 of the Minutes — page 25: “A Government amendment proposing a new sub-clause (b) in substitution of the existing sub-clause was ruled out of order by the Chairman inasmuch as the same provided for grants to be made by the University Grants Commission for the maintenance of universities established under Central Act. The amendment was considered to be beyond the scope of the Bill.” The same amendment has been brought before the House now except for the omission of four words in the last paragraph of this amendment.

Dr. M.M. Das: Sir, may I speak a word?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I will not allow the hon. Member to interrupt. What is this impatience? I am only asking the hon. Member to be somewhat patient; I will give him his chance.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: If you want me to read that amendment, I shall do so. It is the same, word for word except for four words in the last line; almost an identical amendment is there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What was the hon. Member to say?

Dr. M.M. Das: I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the Chairman of the Committee has also opined this way. He says: “The Committee, however, feel that the matter should be left to be decided by the House.” The hon. Member did not mention it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where is it?

Dr. M.M. Das: It is on page vi of the Joint Committee’s report under the heading: ‘Report of the Joint Committee’.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not able to locate it.

Dr. M.M. Das: It is on page vi — Roman characters.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Page vi, para 21, clause 22. But that is different.

Dr. M.M. Das: I am sorry, Sir. I have confused.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, we do not have any such opinion from the Chairman.

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): May I explain the actual position with regard to this clause? This amendment was moved at the Joint Committee and the Chairman ruled it out of order. I argued with him and discussed the matter with him; he was good enough to allow this discussion in the Committee. But the Members were not willing to accept this amendment and therefore by sheer majority this was not accepted. Later on the Chairman gave permission that if the Government liked they could move an amendment in the House and therefore this amendment has been moved.

May I have our permission to explain the purpose of this amendment? It does not go beyond the scope of this Bill. The main purpose of this Bill is to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in universities and for that purpose to establish a University Grants Commission. The functions of the Commission have been described as to allocate and disburse, out of the fund of the Commission, grants to universities for any general or specified purpose. So, the grants may be given for the maintenance of universities; grants may be given for the promotion and development of universities. So, I do not think that the maintenance of the Central universities is beyond the scope of this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the need for this amendment?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Since a doubt was raised by some Members, I thought it necessary to clarify the whole position. It is with that purpose that this amendment has been brought forward.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then why was an amendment tabled before the Joint Committee? Was a doubt raised before it?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: On the point of order and on the matter of substance, I wish to say a few words. The point of order is that this Bill authorises the University Grants Commission to pay grants to universities for specified or general purposes. But the amendment which is sought to be moved wants to give grants for maintenance purposes also. The facts placed before the House by Shri Ramachandra Reddi are substantially true. It is true that this amendment was moved and it was also true that the Chairman ruled it out of order as being beyond the scope of the Bill. Today the point is whether the new idea that is being imported is beyond the scope of the Bill.

According to the clause as it stands, it does not provide for maintenance grants. It simply says: 'to allocate and disburse out of the fund of the Commission grants to universities for any general or specified purpose'. This amendment seeks to give an example of a particular or specific purpose and that is the maintenance grant. The point of view before the Joint Committee was this. There are only four Central universities while all the rest are State universities. By means of this provision, it may be that the Government of India may make use of the funds of this Commission to give their support to the Central universities. We thought that it would be better, if it was possible, to separate these two things. Moneys can be given by the Government direct, taking into consideration other matters. But the Government's point of view has been that since the university grants are to be dealt with by this Commission this matter of maintenance grants also may be left to them. If I can read from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it says:

"It is therefore proposed to establish a University Grants Commission as a corporate body which will inquire into the financial needs of Universities and allocate and disburse grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose."

'Maintenance grant' is a specified purpose. I do not think that it is beyond the scope of the Bill.

It appears to my mind that the objection that was raised was two-fold — on substance as well as on a point of order. If we go through the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I do not see there is any difficulty with regard to the scope of the Bill.

With regard to the merits of the case, whether maintenance grants should be included and whether they should be given separately by the Government of India to these Central universities, it is a different matter. But with regard to the point of order, I think that there is no substance. If any specified grant can be given under the Bill as envisaged now and also in the original Bill, I do not think there should be any objection to incorporate any specific purpose and this matter of maintenance grants is only a specified purpose. I do not think it is a matter which is beyond the scope of this Bill.

With regard to the substance in it it is not the time to talk about substance.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: "Specific purpose" does not mean "maintenance". "Specific purpose" means some work which is specified and not for a maintenance grant which is an ordinary thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, what is "general"? It is said here: "General or specific purpose". Will not the word "general" include maintenance?

Shri K.C. Sodhia: The word "general" includes maintenance also; but, all the universities require to have maintenance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are State universities and there are also Central universities. The Commission is to regulate the money put into use by the Central universities. If anybody is prepared to give some more funds it may be taken. Therefore, does not the term 'general purpose' include this?

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: If I may clarify, "specific purpose" means; supposing a grant is given to the Madras Government....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Scientific laboratories, engineering implements, opening an engineering college and so on.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, you may kindly see clause 12 and then the point of order will be still more clear. It says:

"....all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities, and for purpose of performing its functions under this Act, etc."

These are the general duties and what follow are only specific instances of duties and how they are to be performed. In the present amendment instead of the words "maintenance of standards" the words are "maintenance and development of such universities". Maintenance of universities is quite different from maintenance of standards. Here the emphasis seems to be more so far as the Central universities are concerned whereas in clause 12 the maintenance of standards in all the universities is mentioned. These Central universities being those which are financed by the Government of India it is apprehended that most of the money will go to them for their maintenance and when that is exhausted then the balance money will be distributed for the general purpose of maintenance of standards etc. in other universities. According to the Statement of Objects and Reasons as well as clause 12 the idea was that all the universities were to be treated alike and what was to be encouraged was the maintenance of standards of teaching etc. in all the universities. If you allow this amendment to be made that means that the specific purpose of the University Grants Commission will be to start with the maintenance and development of these Central universities

and, subsequently, whatever is left may be divided for other purposes. It is not a question of merely a point of order, it is a question of very great substance. They are really changing the very basis on which the University Grants Commission is being appointed. Therefore, I support the point of order and I beg of you kindly to disallow this amendment.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Sir, I support the point of order but on a different basis. I am not going into the substance of the amendment. I raise an objection based on the rules of procedure. I find that in the general rules of procedure there is a particular provision which would make it impossible to accept this amendment or to take a decision apart from what was decided in the Joint Committee. For your information, Sir, I will read out the relevant portion. It is rule 326, sub-rule (3) which says:

“An amendment on a question shall not be inconsistent with the previous decision on the same question.”

Here it is a decision made by the Chairman of a Joint Committee. A Chairmar who functions in a Joint Committee almost exercises powers which the Speaker would have exercised had he been present in the Joint Committee. It is very clearly stated here on page 25 of the Report of the Joint Committee, which was pointed out by my hon. friend Shri Ramachandra Reddi, that the Chairman disallowed the amendment. Therefore, this is a matter which has been decided by a Committee of the Parliament appointed by a motion of this House the Chairman of which is supposed to have exercised powers and functions similar to those of the Speaker if the Speaker was present.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: There is no *res judicata*. The Speaker can change the Chairman's ruling.

Shri V.P. Nayar: I know what is *res judicata*. Unfortunately there is a rule in the rules of procedure which says that an amendment on a question shall not be inconsistent with the previous decision on the same question.

An Hon. Member: It was decided by a different House.

Shri V.P. Nayar: There is no distinction between this House and a Committee. The House is not capable of discussing it in its entirety and therefore the House appoints a Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does it not say: “decision made in the same session”?

Shri V.P. Nayar: No mention is made like that.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, a Select Committee consists of

only 40 persons whereas the House consists of 500 Members and the Speaker is the supreme authority.

Shri V.P. Nayar: If the Chairman of a Joint Committee does not exercise the same powers and functions as delegated by the Speaker then the argument has force. What is the position of the Speaker.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members on a point of order will kindly state the reasons for or against it. Elaborate discussions are not necessary unless I am unable to understand the arguments.

Shri V.P. Nayar: I did not think so. My only objection is that this amendment is inconsistent with the previous decision and therefore it is not admissible under the rules.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): I think the whole question boils down to this, as to whether maintenance would be covered by the term "general purpose". Sub-clause (b) of clause 12 says:

"allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose".

Technically speaking the whole question boils down to this, whether maintenance of a university will be covered by the words "general purpose" or not. If it is covered then there can be no technical objection. The amendment could be ruled out on other grounds saying that it is not right, it is not proper or it is not feasible. You can even say that these universities will get most of the money and so on. But the question as to whether the whole amendment should be ruled out as not being within the scope of the Bill should and could be decided only on these two words "general purpose". My own feeling is: "general purpose" is a wide term and does cover maintenance of universities also. That is one point.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: It is only maintenance of specified universities and not general maintenance.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: It is said: "for any general or specific purpose". The term "general purpose" will include everything. First of all the question is whether you agree to maintenance and secondly the question is whether you are to name the universities and say that their general maintenance will be covered. That is a different point. There cannot be any question of point of order on that. You can only say that in your speech to show that the amendment is wrong and it should not be accepted. You can argue as to why these universities should get prior consideration but you cannot rule out an amendment on that ground. That is my contention.

My second contention is whether it would be proper to rule out maintenance entirely. All the time that we have been discussing this Bill in this House, both when the Bill was introduced and for the last two days, great stress has been laid by all Members from all sections of this House that the less the interference or the power of the Central Government the better. In fact the charge has been that the University Grants Commission, as now likely to be formed under the recommendations of the Joint Committee, must also be quite above the interference by the Central Government. This is what we have been arguing all through at the time of sending the Bill to a Joint Committee and also during the debate on the Report of the Joint Committee. Now, if we say: "No, so far as these universities are concerned let the Central Government have the power of interference by making maintenance grant directly and let other universities be kept out of it". I submit it will not be proper. Once you accept a principle that there should be no interference from the Central Government let not the normal theory "He who pays for the piper calls for the tune" be applied in the case of universities even though they may receive grants. Then, my own opinion is that it will not be consistent—to put it very mildly—to say that these three or four universities should not be covered by this general principle. So far as they are concerned, let the Central Government's interference be there, but let not their maintenance be taken over by the Universities Grants Commission. That is the second point which I submit.

The last point which I desire to submit in this connection is that considering the trend of conditions, mostly financial, in this country, and if we are willing to take a little long-range view of things, with our socialistic pattern, it would be exceedingly difficult for universities, even within the next two or three years, to secure much of the help which they are now receiving from the propertied classes, if I may venture to use that term here. The universities will have to depend on them more and more, I say that even for the purpose of maintenance they must depend upon the public exchequer. That being so, even from the point of view of what ought to be in the larger interest of the universities, themselves, it would not be wise for this House to lay down that the functions of the University Grants Commission and its power to disburse funds should be limited to this, namely, that they shall not make any maintenance allowance. So, from these three considerations – the consideration as to whether it is technically correct, the consideration that we should leave these three or four Central Universities at the

mercy of the Central Government and last but not the least, the consideration that maintenance grants also should be within the functions and powers of the University Grants Commission, and also considering what is likely to happen in the future and in the light of the expanding and progressively increasing needs of the universities, I think it would be desirable not only to allow this amendment to be moved but to give it a careful and sympathetic consideration.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I think you would allow us to speak on the merits. Only the constitutional issue is being considered now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as it is right or wrong — in the sense that it is desirable or not — it is not for me to decide. To allow this or not is not within my jurisdiction. The only point is whether it is beyond the scope of the Bill, and if it is so, what is to be done. This is the simple point. The hon. Member who was just now speaking wanted to reinforce the argument for saying that it is within the scope of the Bill. He need not have made an elaborate argument. The simple point is, whether it is within the scope of the Bill or not. Of course, assuming that the powers are enlarged, it has to be considered whether they are so bad or inconsistent that it will become a new Bill that may have to be introduced within two or three years. It may also arise for consideration. There may be some ancillary or auxiliary or consequential points arising, but if those considerations are to be borne upon this, that is another matter.

Sbri H.N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): If you permit me to say, my submission will be that this amendment is definitely beyond the scope of the Bill and I support the point of order that has been raised. I intervene because I happened to be present at meetings of the Joint Committee, when after the Chairman had ruled a very similar amendment out of order, after some discussion, Government tried to reopen it and the Joint Committee, by a very large majority, refused permission for that matter to be reopened, because, to the Members of the Joint Committee, the question was very plain. I need not take the time of the House because it has already been pointed out that we are going to have this Bill for certain very definite and specific purposes. As far as the Central universities are concerned, their maintenance is a headache of Government in terms of certain statutory provisions which are already there. I do not see why in a roundabout fashion the question of expenses in regard to the maintenance of Central universities, which is the responsibility of the Government to maintain, is being brought in. The object of this legislation is, very obviously, to see that there is co-

ordination and determination of standards in universities and for that purpose, Government is supposed to be generously allocating certain funds for certain very specified purposes—for laboratories, for equipment, for libraries, for hostels, for play-grounds and for Heaven knows what other educational amenities. Therefore, this way of introducing the question of the Central universities appears to me to be extremely improper and particularly in view of the decision of the Joint Committee, the way in which Government has come forward somewhat surreptitiously appears to me to suggest also that something is wrong as far as this particular amendment is concerned. I feel, therefore, that in view of the very specific formulation of the purposes of this Bill and in view of what has happened in the Joint Committee, this amendment should be ruled out of order by the Chair.

Shri Altekhar (North Satara) *rose—*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How many Members am I going to hear on this point of order?

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: It is a simple matter.

Shri Altekhar: I rose once.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As soon as a point is raised, I note down all those hon. Members who want to speak. Of course, as discussion goes on, some doubts and differences arise to everyone.

Shri Altekhar: I only want to speak on the amendment and not on the point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, he will have the opportunity to speak later.

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Distt. — North): I may draw your attention to line 3 of clause 12. In that line, the word “promotion” occurs. The clause says:

“It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education....” etc.

If the word “promotion” is there, I suppose it will include maintenance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 1 stands in the name of Government. The point that has been raised is that it is beyond the scope of the Bill in that the Bill is intended to establish a Commission for the purpose of allocation and distribution of funds for the purpose of bringing about a uniform standard or co-ordinating the efforts of the

universities, and that this amendment relates to the day-to-day maintenance of the centrally administered universities. It was said in support of the point of order that this amendment ought not to have been allowed and it should be ruled out of order and that while this Bill was before the Joint Committee the same amendment was brought in to clause 12. It was sought to be introduced by the Government, and an objection was taken, and the Chairman ruled it out as it being beyond the scope of the Bill, as would appear from the printed copy of the report of the Joint Committee at page 25. It has also been stated that the Chairman of the Joint Committee is clothed with all the powers of the Chairman or the Speaker presiding over the deliberations of this Parliament in respect of the matter that comes up for discussion, and that the ruling of the Chairman of the Joint Committee is binding upon this House.

It was also stated that a decision taken at one stage – and that relates to an amendment and no such decision is conclusive – regarding the admissibility of an amendment is not open to revision at another stage.

So far as these two objections are concerned, I do not agree that the Chairman of a Joint Committee can block out his ruling on admitting or non-admitting an amendment, and I do not think he can prevent this House to go into this matter. It is open to the House to come to a different conclusion, and even if that matter has been gone into by the Joint Committee, it is open to this House to send it back to the Joint Committee if it involves a consideration of facts and figures and various other considerations which could not be easily brought before this House. If the House thinks it advisable to refer the matter back to the Joint Committee, it will do so. The decision of the Chairman of the Joint Committee or even the decision of the Joint Committee as a whole is not binding on this House. Of course, the House proceeds with the proposals of the Joint Committee as the basis and then it comes to a conclusion of its own. Thus, whatever powers the Joint Committee may have, even if the Deputy-Speaker happens to be the Chairman of that Committee and if he gives a ruling there, sitting here it is open to him to say that ruling is not binding on the House. Therefore, so far as that objection is concerned, that is a matter which can be taken into consideration, here, not for the purpose of blocking further proceedings in this House, but if the House as a whole takes a different view. I come to the other point, namely, whether a decision given at one stage ought not to be interfered with and is binding at another stage. If this House rejects one amendment, the hon. Member cannot bring in an amendment

of the same kind in another clause of this Bill. That is what it relates to and nothing more than that. So far as these objections are concerned, I do not think there is any force and these cannot stand in the way of this amendment being allowed. But independently, this House can go into this question as to whether this is within the scope of the Bill or not. We have to bring to bear our own independent judgement. I have got some doubts. This is, in my opinion, an absolutely a different matter that is sought to be introduced by this amendment. If hon. Members will kindly refer to the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution, they will find that there are two different entries under which power is given to the Central Government. Entry No. 63 says:

“The institutions known at the commencement of this Constitution as the Benaras Hindu University, the Aligarh Muslim University and the Delhi University, and any other institution declared by Parliament by law to be an institution of national importance.”

That is, the day-to-day maintenance of these institutions entirely depends on the Central Government, just as the State Universities are directly managed through the Syndicate, Vice-Chancellors etc. Whatever powers are exercised by the State Governments over the State Universities, similar powers are exercised by the Central Government over their Universities. This is about day-to-day maintenance. So far as co-ordination is concerned,— this Bill refers to co-ordination — the Central Government has jurisdiction over the State University also. Otherwise this Central Government, whatever may be its importance in the Parliament, has no jurisdiction over the State universities. It is only by virtue of entry 66 in the Seventh Schedule which says:

“Co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions.”

Word for word this has been copied in the Preamble to this Bill. Therefore, the object of this Bill is co-ordination. The State Government continues to control the day-to-day management of the State universities, but if for want of funds or for want of adequate personnel the standard is low, then the University Grants Commission wants to bring it to a uniform level. For this purpose of co-ordination, extraordinary power is given to the Central Government. Under entry 63, a normal, ordinary power is sought to be exercised by the Central Government with respect to its universities, just as the State Government exercises

powers in relation to its universities. It is their institutions and they are bound to manage and look after the day-to-day administration. But this is an extraordinary power for the purpose of co-ordination. As far as this fund is concerned, not only the Central Government but any other person can contribute to it also; if I am wrong I may be corrected, but I think even the State Governments can contribute to it.

Dr. M.M. Das: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, whereas the Central universities are the responsibility of the Centre, this fund is pooled from all sources for the purpose of bringing about co-ordination amongst all universities. Therefore, it is absolutely a different purpose for which some special agency is created. The various State Universities with their autonomies are prepared to submit themselves in the hands of this Commission for receiving some money. The Commission is given power also to check and impose a penalty by withholding whatever grant may be given. The two are absolutely different purposes. This will lead to some other consequences also. When the universities are being brought under the Commission, their autonomy will be destroyed. That is another matter. So far as co-ordination is concerned, the universities have to suffer and lose whatever autonomy is destroyed, if they want money from the Commission. There is another thing. The Parliament has direct control through the Ministry over these universities. Is it contemplated in this that Parliament should hand over this also to the hands of the Commission? Are these people competent to go into the day-to-day management? This seems to be absolutely different from the other. The Education Ministry or the sponsors of this Bill want to create an indirect corporation for the purpose of managing the three institutions. This is not the object of this co-ordination. I wonder why this has been brought by way of management. I feel that in all these matters, the Chairman never takes the responsibility of ruling out an amendment, but leaves it to the House with whatever opinions he has.

One other point has been raised, namely, that this can be brought under the term "general purpose". Clause 12(b) says:

"(b) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose;" etc.

"General purpose" must be read in accordance with the Preamble that is given here. Therefore, "general purpose" does not stand all

alone; it is general purpose consistent with the purposes that are set out in the Preamble. Clause 12 says:

“It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching....”
etc.

The word “promotion” ought not to be taken away from the context; the words “promotion and co-ordination” and “determination and maintenance” go together. For the purpose of co-ordination, promotion may be necessary and for the purpose of promotion, co-ordination may be necessary. It is not for the purpose of starting and maintaining the show itself. If it is already there, embellish it, make it grow further. For the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching; determination of teaching; in a mathematical proposition, if it is $A \text{ plus } B \times C$, it is $AB \text{ plus } AC$. Therefore, determination and maintenance of standards means determination of standards and maintenance of standards. Then, “examination and research in Universities, and for the purpose of performing its functions under this Act, the Commission may....”. Therefore, this is *ejusdem generis*. General purposes must be consonant with the purposes laid down in the earlier portion of clause 12. These are all the points which are apparent and which seem to go to the root of the matter. However, it is for the House to decide. I will allow these amendments to be moved. Then,....

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): What about the point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the point of order is concerned, I do not accept the point of order. We are not bound by a ruling of the other House. That was the point of order raised. I rule out the point of order. As a matter of first impression brought before the House whether I ought to allow or ought not to allow, I have made my remarks. I do not take the responsibility. I leave it to the House to decide and to the Government to decide.

Shri T.N. Singh: Does it mean that just before we proceed with the discussion, the House should decide whether it is within the scope of the Bill or not? What is left to the decision of the House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. What will happen is, the House can debate. Every hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak on the amendments, clauses and sub-clauses and they have their say. Ultimately,

in the matter of voting, it is open to hon. Members to say, it is useless and it ought not to be allowed. In voting, they may vote against.

Shri T.N. Singh: We individual Members do not know what is the mind of the House. We may be wasting the time of the House in discussion. Is it not proper to know the mind of the House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. The principle is very wrong. I would say 'yes' if the House wants to say 'No'; I would say 'No' if the House says 'Yes'. It is a curious way. Hon. Members are expected to come to their independent judgement on matters that arise, and try to persuade the whole House to their point of view. All the 499 Members may be against the hon. Member. The hon. Member has got persuasive eloquence. Even though he may be in a minority, he may be able to persuade the entire opposition. It is rather a curious thing.

Shri T.N. Singh: If we are to speak one after another and then it is decided that it is not within the scope and therefore the House should not consider, we need not go into the merits. Where will it lead us to?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no, I will put it to the House and we will know where we are.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: May I be permitted to explain the point of view of the Government?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him speak on the Government amendment. All these amendments are before the House. Amendment Nos. 1, 3, 11, 12, 13, 44, 46, 69, 70 and 71. Amendment No. 71 is a new amendment. The clause, the sub-clauses and the amendments are before the House. Hon. Members may speak on all. They will not have another chance.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Allow us to speak on our amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: First, I am allowing the hon. Deputy-Minister to speak on the Government amendment.

Shri Jhunjunwala (Bhagalpur Central): We have not got amendment No. 71.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri B.K. Das will read his amendment because a copy of it has not been circulated.

Shri B.K. Das: My amendment reads thus:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8 —

omit "if such information is asked for".

I shall explain it later.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: It is a formal amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So all these amendments may be moved.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 31—

after University education” *insert* “and finances”.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 24 —

add at the end:

“including the institution of free studentship, stipends, scholarships and fellowships to be awarded by them to deserving students;”

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: I beg to move:

Page 4, lines 27 and 28 —

after “the standard attained by it” *insert*:

“the measures undertaken by it for encouraging the development of any of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.”

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

Page 5 —

after line 4, *add* new sub-clause:

“advise the Central Government in regard to instituting or awarding any scholarship, fellowship or stipend, *ad hoc* or permanent, either for study in a foreign country or in India, which shall be referred to it by the Central Government;”

Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg to move:

Page 4, lines 15 to 21 —

omit all the words *after* the word “to”.

Shri B.K. Das: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 39 —

after “if such advice is asked for” *insert* “or otherwise”.

Shri K.K. Basu: I beg to move:

Page 4, line 19 —

after “Universities” *insert* “and for the promotion and expansion of sports and physical culture among the students and staff of the Universities”.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: I beg to move:

Page 4, after line 41, insert:

“(ee) recommend to the President of the Indian Union for granting charters, provisional or permanent, for the establishment of a new University or for conversion of any affiliated or independent institution into a provisional or permanent recognised University;

(eee) suggest, advise or recommend to the Central Government or any State Government for the establishment of institutions or rural Universities for the promotion of higher and advanced study in rural areas.”

Shri B.K. Das: I beg to move:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8 –

omit “if such information is asked for”.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these amendments and the one moved earlier by Dr. M.M. Das are now before the House.

Dr. K.L. Shrimall: With all respect to the Members who have spoken on the subject, I would like to place the point of view of the Government. I would request them to give it due consideration.

I would like to remind the House about the history of the University Grants Committee. The University Grants Committee was established to look after the Central Universities. Government have always felt, as far as the Universities are concerned, that it would be much better if there is an independent body, like a Grants Commission to look after the Universities so that their academic freedom may be maintained and there may not be day-to-day interference in their administration. The Central Government has direct responsibility for four Central Universities. The Universities Grants Committee, in the beginning, was looking after only the Central Universities. Later on, it was found that the functions of the and scope of the Universities Grants Committee should be expanded. That was quite right, because the Central Government have responsibility not only for the Central Universities, but some for the other Universities also. It was to discharge that duty that this whole Bill has been brought forward.

As far as the Central Universities are concerned, the Central Government have a responsibility and they cannot shirk it. Funds will be placed at the disposal of the Commission for the maintenance of the Universities. Suppose this amendment is ruled out of order or we do not

accept, what would be the result? There will be two agencies, as far as the Central Universities are concerned. There will be the University Grants Commission which would look after the development of the State Universities as well as the Central Universities and there will be the Ministry of Education dealing with the maintenance of Central Universities.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

It will not serve the interests of the Universities as a whole not to accept this amendment. It would be most unfortunate if there are two agencies dealing with the Central Universities. In any case we should not think that the Government have unlimited funds. If the University Grants Commission does not look after the maintenance of the Central Universities, naturally, funds meant for that purpose cannot be placed at the disposal of the University Grants Commission. All that we can insist on is that funds meant for the maintenance of the Universities may be specified. But, I think it will be a very healthy convention if the University Grants Commission looks after the maintenance as well as the development of the Universities as far as the Central Universities are concerned and the development of the other Universities all over India.

This point was discussed at the Joint Committee and I tried to place this point of view before the Members. Unfortunately, there is a good deal of distrust and suspicion. It is with a view to remove all suspicion and distrust that I accepted all the amendments which were made in the Joint Committee. I think it is very important that the University Grants Commission should make a firm start that there is no rivalry between the Government and the University Grants Commission. There should really be a partnership. When there is a full partnership between the University Grants Commission and the Government, then only, University education will be promoted. I would therefore request hon. Members to remove all kinds of fears and apprehensions from their minds. The purpose of the Government clearly is to develop the Universities. If we do not place funds at the disposal of the University Grants Commission for the maintenance of the Central Universities, naturally, these funds will be taken away from the University Grants Commission. Is it not in the interests of the Universities that at least as regards the Central Universities, maintenance as well as development of the Universities should be looked after by an independent body? Government are only giving away or delegating certain powers to an independent body. I would request hon. Members not to have fears or suspicions in their

minds as regards this amendment. It is only with a view to establishing healthy conventions and democratic traditions in our country that we are moving this amendment. I hope in course of time in the States also they will delegate their powers to the University Grants Commission so that direct control by the State is taken away from the universities. It is only in that atmosphere of freedom, that the universities will have a healthy growth.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar rose—

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed further, may I just submit one thing for the consideration of the House? The time at our disposal is very short. We have already taken nine or ten hours so far as the consideration stage is concerned, and four hours were to be devoted to this stage out of which some time was taken away yesterday by the hon. Minister's speech. We are now only on clause 12. There are other important clauses also. So, I would request every Member to be very brief so as to enable the House to finish this stage of the Bill by 2.30.

Shri T.S.A. Chettiar: With regard to the merits of the amendment that has been moved by Government, it is true that there is a general suspicion, because a lumpsum is allotted to the University Grants Commission. If it so happens that a large part of the lumpsum goes for maintenance also, the other universities will suffer. That is really the suspicion under which the Joint Committee did labour, and that was the main reason why they did not vote for that amendment. It is for the Government and the University Grants Commission to remove that suspicion by action, and when they do allot, I would request them to allot, I would request them to allot in two categories, namely maintenance and development, so that the other universities will feel that they are getting a proper deal.

Let me go to the amendment which stands in my name. I consider it a very important amendment. It says that money must be made available also for "the measures undertaken by it for encouraging the development of any of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution." I think there is an unnecessary quotation mark after the words "undertaken by it". In this matter I am glad the Government have given a categorical assurance in their reply that it will be the job of the Central Government not only to develop one language which may be described as the official language of the Union, but also all the other languages, all the national languages belonging to this great country. I would suggest that grants must be made available to the universities for this purpose of the development of the various languages

in this country. There has been a move and rightly, to make the regional languages—not only the regional languages, every language of the country—to be the medium of instruction in the various colleges. There is also a fear that the introduction of this medium will bring down the standards, but if we are to avoid this fear, it is very necessary that we must prepare beforehand. We cannot make a language the medium of instruction unless it is developed and books are published, first-class works are written in it, and this will require a great deal of money. When we considered it at a recent committee meeting in Madras we calculated it will require many, many lakhs in each language, and the development of this country will largely depend on the development of its languages in these very fields, and I should consider that amendment like this will be pointing out the importance of this in matters of allotment of funds.

I am glad that an assurance has been given, and I hope that it will be confirmed by the Government even on this clause that in future particular attention will be paid to this aspect of the question, and that development of standards will really mean development of our languages also, not merely from the literary point of view, but from the point of view of content that is, that they must contain in themselves the highest works in all these subjects.

I do not like to take much of your time. I hope the idea will be accepted by the Government as in the past.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Chairman: I am not disposed to call each and every Member. They must remember that we must finish the other clauses also by 2.30. I therefore request the hon. Member, Shri Nayar, to take as little time as possible.

Shri T.N. Singh: This is a very important clause.

Mr. Chairman: This is a very important clause, but clause 5 was equally important, and other clauses which are coming are also equally important.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Could I know how many minutes I can take.

Mr. Chairman: I have submitted that by 2.30 we have to finish.

Shri V.P. Nayar: I will take as little time as possible. My amendment is No. 69 and I want certain words to be added in the body of clause 12. I do not want to go into all the details. I do not want them to be repeated again because we have had a discussion during last session on certain matters relating to sports and games, but my contention is that if the object is co-ordination of university education and determination of

standards in universities, the physical standards of students will also come in this.

To say the least of it, the physical standards of our university students is in a very bad condition and Government have done precious little about it all these years. In the draft of the First Five Year Plan there was a proposal to set up a Central Institute of Physical Culture. It remains even today after four or five years, merely a proposal and not step has been taken for the establishment of such an institution. Also you will find from the figures published by Government in its publication "Education in India" that physical education actually does not even cover three out of 1,000 students in colleges. It is a very appalling state of affairs that such a very essential requirement in university education should be subjected to such gross neglect by the authorities. I cannot think of any co-ordination in the standards of universities unless an attempt is made to co-ordinate the standards of physical efficiency of the university students also. Therefore, I want these words to be specifically mentioned in clause 12.

The daily attendance of students in the colleges is a matter of very grave concern. From Government's figures it would appear that if we take the entire student population of India, about 50 lakh students do not find it possible to attend. They have to be absent. The daily attendance of college students I should think will be that about 20 per cent. at least will not be able to attend daily.

Shri T.N. Singh: We have all done proxies in our time.

Shri V.P. Nayar: You were very clever.

Twenty to twenty-five per cent. of college students will not be able to attend for various reasons. One important reason is lack of proper health. There are ever so many diseases which could have been avoided provided the universities gave them the proper facilities. As you observed yesterday, almost all universities and all colleges have inadequate facilities for physical exercises and for sports and games, although there is no laxity shown in the matter of collecting the athletic fees. It is a matter which must be tackled on an all-India level, and I think specific grants will have to be made for the better co-ordination of the physical activities of the university students.

Dr. M.M. Das: What is the number of the amendment?

Shri V.P. Nayar: 69. So, all that you have heard till now has no meaning.

Mr. Chairman: He knew the subject, he wants to know the number of amendment now.

Dr. M.M. Das: On a point of order, games and sports, physical culture etc., are a State subject. The Central Government has got no right to legislate upon it. This Union Parliament is debarred from legislating upon sports and games etc. because it is entirely a State subject.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Education also, my hon. friend knows, is a State subject.

Dr. M.M. Das: But Entry No. 66 is there, on the strength of which we have this legislation before this House.

Shri V.P. Nayar: That reinforces what I said before, that my hon. friend has been hearing nothing. I said that the determination of standards must necessarily include the determination of physical standards, not merely the academic standards. I could understand my hon. friend's argument if in the Title, the phrase 'determination of standards' had been confined to determination of standards only in regard to academic attainments. But it has not been restricted like that, I think Dr. M.M. Das in his misplaced enthusiasm was referring to something which was not relevant.

I want Government to consider this matter in a more realistic way. It is no good coming here and telling us that it is a State subject. True, it is a State subject, but here we are trying to co-ordinate certain aspects of university life which is not confined merely to academic attainments. So, I once again request that Government may be pleased to accept this amendment of mine, so that the matter will be specifically mentioned in the Bill itself. Government seem to have an aversion at present to considering the case of the students getting more and more facilities for physical exercise, as is shown by the observations made by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. So, unless it is specifically mentioned, there is a chance, as we have seen now from what the reaction was, of the University Grants Commission not earmarking any amount for the better co-ordination of the physical standards of university students. That is the reason why I have sent in this amendment. At least my hon. friend Dr. K.L. Shrimali who is here happens to know some details about this matter, although the Minister himself does not. I hope that he will see his way to accept this amendment.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Clause 12 lays down the functions of the University Grants Commission that is going to be set up under this measure. The University Education Commission has suggested a large number of measures for the reform, expansion, and promotion of university and advanced education in the country. And I think the

University Grants Commission is the body that is meant to carry out the recommendations as far as the Central Government are concerned. I would therefore suggest that this body should be given sufficient powers for the purpose. They have been given the power of the purse to carry out the recommendations, and they have also been assigned certain functions.

But by my amendment No. 70, I want to add two more functions to the Commission. The first will be to recommend to the President of the Indian Union for granting charters, provisional or permanent, for the establishment of a new university or for conversion of any affiliated or independent institution into a provisional or permanent recognized university. Yesterday I spoke on this point at great length, and I wanted the new universities also to be included in the definition of the word 'university'. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary replied that they were included already in the provisions contained in clause 3. But the reason why I want to include this function specifically is this, namely that this Commission should give sufficient attention towards the establishment of new universities or for the conversion of existing colleges or other institutions into new universities, as was suggested by the University Education Commission, from whose report I read out an extract yesterday.

I find from clause 12 that one of the functions of this Commission will be the promotion and co-ordination of university education. Item (3) in clause 12 refers to that function and says:

“advise any authority, if such advice is asked for, on the establishment of a new University or on proposals connected with the expansion of the activities of any University;”.

And under item (f), if the Central Government or any State Government or any university refers any matter to this Commission for advice, then it will be the function of this Commission to offer their advice. My suggestion is that that is not sufficient. The Commission should be given still wider powers. Looking into the recommendations of the University Education Commission we find that this Commission should be responsible for the expansion and development of university and advanced education in this country, and it is for that purpose that they are going to be given sufficient funds. So, I would suggest that the Commission should be authorized to look into the question of the setting up of new universities as well.

The second function that I want to add is this. The Commission should be authorized to suggest, advise or recommend to the Central

Government or any State Government for the establishment of institutions or rural universities for the promotion of higher one and advanced study in rural areas. A large number of hon. Members while taking part in the general discussion have already emphasised the importance of rural universities. So far, the rural areas have been neglected, and practically all the funds that are spent on advanced or university education go only to the urban areas. The University Education Commission have devoted a lot of space in their report towards this particular matter, and have suggested that both the Central and the State Governments should take steps for the promotion and establishment of rural universities. So far as we know, only one or two universities in the rural areas are going to be set up. But that is not enough. I therefore suggest that the University Grants Commission should have this also as one of their functions, so that they could encourage and advise the State and Central Governments to take suitable steps for the establishment of rural universities.

By amendment No. 11, I want to emphasise that it should be one of the functions of this Commission to provide funds for the institution of free-ships, stipends etc. to deserving students. No doubt, item (i) reads:

“perform such other functions as may be prescribed or as may be deemed necessary by the Commission for advancing the cause of higher education in India or as may be incidental or conducive to the discharge of the above functions.”

and this may cover this aspect too. But I want this matter to be specifically mentioned in the body of the Bill, and with that end in view I want to add at the end of line 24 on page 4, the following words:

“including the institution of free studentships, stipends, scholarships and fellowships to be awarded by them to deserving students;”

In this connection, I would like to refer to what the University Education Commission have stated in their report. In India not more than 10 per cent. of students only are getting free scholarships or studentships. This results in a very large number of meritorious students being debarred from going to the colleges for higher education. Now that some funds are going to be placed in the hands of the University Grants Commission, I would suggest that they should allot funds to the universities for this purpose also, so that meritorious students may not be debarred from pursuing higher education.

I now come to my last amendment, namely amendment No. 13. With the permission of the Deputy-Speaker who was in the Chair earlier, I have made a small change in this amendment. Under item (f), the Commission is charged with the function of offering advice to the Central or State Governments or the universities on any question which may be referred to them. I want to add another item (ff) which reads as follows:

“advise the Central Government in regard to instituting or awarding any scholarship, fellowship or stipend, *ad hoc* or permanent, either for study in a foreign country or in India, which shall be referred to it by the Central Government;”

At present, a number of Ministries of Government are instituting or awarding scholarships, fellowships or stipends on an *ad hoc* or a permanent basis. But the University Grants Commission being an expert body will have in their possession information from all the universities on this matter, and therefore they will be better fitted to disburse the funds. I therefore suggest that any funds that are meant for this purpose should be placed in the hands of the Commission, and it should be left to the Commission to disburse those funds to the different universities in a proper manner.

If my amendments are accepted, they will only clarify the position further, and will also emphasise the importance of some of the functions which may be neglected otherwise. With these words, I commend my amendments for the acceptance of the House.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I cannot allow any more time. I would have liked to give opportunity to Members to speak further. But the difficulty is that now it is 2-20 P.M. and we have not got much time.

Shri T.N. Singh: I wanted to have at least one point clarified, since the Parliamentary Secretary is now going to reply. It is in regard to the determination of standards in Universities. It is rather a wide thing. We do not know whether the Commission has got the personnel to determine standards in Universities. There are various subjects, 30 or 40, ranging from economics, history, politics, geography and all kinds of things. We do not find anything in the Bill which entitles the Commission to have the personnel necessary for the purpose; we do not know what personnel the Commission will have from among themselves to determine standards in Universities. That is what was worrying me, whether the

Commission has got the personnel to start the inquisition. So the hon. Parliamentary Secretary may kindly clarify this point.

Shri B.K. Das: I want to speak.

Mr. Chairman: On the amendment moved by the hon. Member.

Shri B.K. Das: I want to speak on amendment No. 46, not on No. 71.

Mr. Chairman: The difficulty is that then there will be no time for the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to reply and I shall have to guillotine all these amendments.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I have to speak only for two minutes.

Mr. Chairman: He has already spoken on his amendment during the general discussion.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I spoke then about the amendments, but I did not speak specifically about this.

Mr. Chairman: On the amendment about finances, the hon. Member has already spoken.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I spoke generally about the amendments.

Mr. Chairman: My difficulty is that then there will be no time left for the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to reply. I would have liked to give full time to every Member.

Shri K.C. Sodhia: I will take only two minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Those two minutes will be taken from the time of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I propose to finish this by 2-30 p.m. I am very sorry to have to take up this attitude.

Dr. M.M. Das: I do not propose to waste the time of the House by discussing the *pros and cons* and merits and demerits of the amendments proposed by Government. Sufficient discussion has taken place and many hon. Members have spoken upon them. Now the House has to decide.

Regarding the amendment of my hon. friend, Shri V.P. Nayar, I have already said: that the amendment should be ruled out of order because there is item 33 of the State List which says: "Theatres and dramatic performances; cinemas subject to the provisions of entry 60 of List I; sports, entertainments and amusements". Thus, the Union Parliament has got no jurisdiction to legislate upon those subjects.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Does not education also come within that List?

Shri T.N. Singh: Parliament also comes under it, in that way.

Dr. M.M. Das: As regards amendment No. 70, it proposes to ask the Commission to recommend to the President for granting charters to Universities. Now, so far as this country is concerned, our Universities have been established and are at present being established by legislatures, namely, by State laws or Central laws. Not a single University in this country has got a charter from the Governor-General or the President. So it will create a new thing in this country so far as the establishment of a University is concerned.

Shri Meghnad Saha: The older Universities were also created by charter, for example, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras Universities.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Thank him for the information and proceed.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: He referred to charters. You were referring to a new thing. What is the use of bringing in things before 1857? Carry on.

Dr. M.M. Das: Here at present Universities are being established under Acts of the State Legislatures or the Central Legislature. In the amendment, it is proposed that the Commission will make a recommendation to the President to issue a charter establishing a University by-passing the State and Central Legislatures. I am sorry I cannot accept this amendment.

The second part of the amendment says that the Commission may suggest, advise or recommend to the Central Government or any State Government for the establishment of institutions or rural Universities for the promotion of higher and advanced study in rural areas. The House knows that the Government of India are going to establish very soon a Council on Rural Education. The Committee on Rural Education submitted their report only a few months back and Government have considered that report and are taking steps for the improvement of rural education. The Council, which will be an expert body that is going to be created very soon, will go into this question and give advice to the Government which will be implemented later. So we do not want that the University Grants Commission should be encumbered with this particular matter.

Shri Altekar: It is the function of the University Grants Commission to deal with Universities. What is the harm in giving this function to them and making a specific mention in the clause.

Dr. M.M. Das: At present, there is no rural University. When it will be established either by a State legislature or the Central legislature, it will automatically come within the purview of the University Grants Commission.

As regards scholarships and stipends, a large number of scholarships has been instituted for special purposes, like giving encouragement to Scheduled Castes etc. and also for general purposes, for post-graduate training, practical training etc. Large sums of money are being spent every year by the Government of India on these scholarships. The University Grants Commission is going to be established for a definite purpose. We do not think that it will do any good by placing so many other functions upon the shoulders of the Commission.

So far as amendment No. 71 of Shri B.K. Das's, is concerned, as I have told you before, we are accepting it.

Mr. Chairman: Now, I shall put the amendments to the vote of the House. The amendments are Nos. 1, 12, 3, 13 (in the amended form), 71, 69, 44, 70, 11 and 46.

Shri V.P. Nayar: Amendment No. 69 may be put separately.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Dr. M.M. Das: Amendment No. 1 is a Government amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I propose to put amendments Nos. 1, 71 and 69 separately. If any hon. Member wants any other amendment to be put separately, I shall put it separately.

The question is:

Page 4 –

for lines 23 to 29, substitute:

“(b) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities established or incorporated by or under a Central Act for the maintenance and development of such Universities or for any other general or specified purpose;

(bb) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, such grants to other Universities as it may deem necessary for the development of such Universities or for any other general or specified purpose:

Provided that in making any grant to any such University, the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the University concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purposes which it may serve.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 4, line 19 –

after “Universities” *insert*:

“and for the promotion and expansion of sports and physical culture among the students and staff of the Universities”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8 –

omit “if such information is asked for”.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Now I will put the other amendments.

The question is:

Page 4, line 31 –

after “University education” *insert* “and finances”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 4, line 24 –

add at the end:

“including the institution of free studentship, stipends, scholarships and fellowships to be awarded by them to deserving students;”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 4, lines 27 and 28 –

after “the standard attained by it” *insert*:

“the measures undertaken by it for encouraging the development of any of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 5 –

after line 4, *add*:

“advise the Central Government in regard to instituting or awarding any scholarship, fellowship or stipend, *ad hoc*

or permanent, either for study in a foreign country or in India, which shall be referred to it by the Central Government;”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 4, lines 15 to 21 –

omit all the words, *after* the word “to”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is :

Page 4, line 39 –

after “if such advice is asked for” *insert* “or otherwise”.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

Page 4 –

after line 41, *insert*:

“(ee) recommend to the President of the Indian Union for granting charters, provisional or permanent, for the establishment of a new University or for conversion of any affiliated or independent institution into a provisional or permanent recognised University;

(eee) suggest, advise or recommend to the Central Government or any State Government for the establishment of institutions or rural Universities for the promotion of higher and advanced study in rural areas.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That clause 12, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12, as amended, was added to the Bill.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Document No. 35

Answers dated 15-3-1954, of Mr. K.D. Malviya in the House of People, on behalf of Maulana Azad to the questions asked regarding the Monazite

Shri Bahadur Singh: Will the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research be pleased to state:

- (a) the quantity of monazite treated at Alwaye during 1953-54;
- (b) the amount of rare earth chlorides and carbonates produced from it; and
- (c) whether this output was exported *in toto* or any part of it was used in local industries?

The Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Shri K.D. Malaviya): (a) and (b) About 1,000 tons.

(c) It is not in the public interest to give this information.

Shri Bahadur Singh: What is the financial position of the industry that produces monazite? Is it running at a loss or at a profit?

Shri K.D. Malaviya: This monazite processing factory is producing rare earth chloride and rare earth carbonate in the quantity I have mentioned, viz. approximately 1,000 tons. We are also getting trisodium phosphate as a by-product, and trisodium phosphate is used for preservation of boilers and fillers in soaps. With regard to profits and losses of the factory, I am not able to give the information, as it is not in public interest.

Shri Bahadur Singh: What is the amount of foreign exchange that we get by exporting monazite to foreign countries?

Mr. Speaker: That would also not be in the public interest to disclose?

Appendix 2

Document No. 36

Reply dated 18-3-1954 by Dr. M.M. Das, the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad, on his behalf in the House of People to the question asked about the Central Translation Library Scheme

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): There is no "Central Translation Library Scheme" under the Ministry. Probably, the hon. Member has in his mind the library which the Central Government has proposed to set up for Hindi which will contain the original or translation of outstanding books and pamphlets in the field of social education in the various regional languages in the country.

Appendix 3

Document No. 37

**Reports regarding the Demand for Grants of Education
Ministry, presented in the House of People on
27-3-1954 and accepted by Maulana Azad**

SCHOLARSHIP TO BACKWARD CLASS STUDENTS

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

WOMEN’S EDUCATION

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

TEACHING THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF MOTHER TONGUE.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

STATUS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF TEACHERS

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

SOUND EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Shri Bahadur Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana-Reserved-Sch. Castes):
I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

INADEQUATE PROVISION FOR EDUCATION

Shri Bahadur Singh: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

REPORT OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Shri Barrow (Nominated – Anglo-Indian): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

SCALES OF PAY FOR TEACHERS

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY PRIMARY EDUCATION

Shri V.P. Nayar: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

PAY OF OFFICERS

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

PATRONAGE TO EXPENSIVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Education’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Appendix 4

Document No. 38

Answers, on behalf of Maulana Azad, by his Parliamentary Secretary in the Council of States (Rajya Sabha) on August 23, 1954

ALL-INDIA PRIMARY TEACHERS' ORGANISATION

Shri P. Sundarayya: (On Behalf of Shri S.N. Mazumdar): Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation from the All-India Primary School Teachers' Organisation;

(b) if so, what are the demands contained in that representation; and

(c) what action has been taken in the matter?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a), (b) and (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) The Ministry of Education has received a copy of the resolutions passed by the All-India Primary Teachers' Conference held at Nagpur on 6th and 7th January 1954.

(b) The Conference has passed a large number of resolutions, some of them dealing with improvement in the terms and conditions of service of primary teachers and others with the introduction of educational improvements in schools. The Conference has, however made three main requests:

- (i) Acceptance of the resolutions passed at the Conference.
- (ii) Improvement of conditions of service and pay scales of teachers.
- (iii) Appointment of a Primary Education Commission.

(c) As regards (i), Primary Education is the responsibility of State Governments and the Central Government is not directly concerned either with the prescribing of syllabuses and text-books or the construction of school buildings. These matters are within the competence of State Governments.

As regards (ii), it is the State Governments that prescribe the terms and conditions of service of teachers. However, the Government of India are aware of the present unsatisfactory salary standards of teachers and have under examination the general question of the revision of teachers' pay scales. The Central Advisory Board of Education has also from time to time drawn the attention of State Governments to the need for ensuring security of service for teachers and improving their general terms and conditions of service.

In regard to (iii), the appointment of a Primary Education Commission is not considered necessary, because the problem of primary education has been surveyed thoroughly and critically by the various committees including the Zakir Husain Committee, which formulated the Scheme of Basic Education and later by committees of the Central Advisory Board of Education which has accepted Basic Education as the future pattern of education for the children of age group 6-14. This is the accepted policy of the Government of India and the State Governments.

This position was pointed out to the conference deputation which waited on the Prime Minister on the 6th July 1954.

Shri P. Sundarayya: Sir, in the statement supplied, with regard to matter (ii), it is said that the Government of India is drawing the attention of the various State Governments to the pay scales of the primary school teachers. What has been the result of this drawing of attention of State Governments as far as the improvement in the pay scales of the primary teachers is concerned?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Government are seriously exercised about the low scales of pay of the primary school teachers and they are anxious to raise the salaries. The whole matter is being considered by the Government at present.

As the hon. Members are aware, primary education is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments but the Central Government and the Planning Commission are finding out if they can make some contribution towards the raising of the salaries.

Shri P. Sundarayya: My question has not been answered. In the statement, it is said that the Government are aware of the present

unsatisfactory salaries and that they had drawn the attention of the State Governments to the need for ensuring security of service to the teachers and for improving their general terms and conditions of service. What has been the result as far as improvement of the pay scales of the teachers is concerned as a result of the drawing of attention of the State Governments to this unsatisfactory state of affairs?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, the whole problem is the raising of the salaries of the teachers. Some of the State Governments have taken action but, as a whole, the result is not satisfactory and we are considering how the Central Government could help the State Governments in raising the salaries.

Shri P. Sundarayya: Is it not a fact that even the recent proposal of the Central Government to start new one-teacher schools has been a failure because of the fact that the State Governments are not prepared to bear the contribution demanded of them by the Central Government? As such, what does the Central Government propose to do to help the State Governments to raise the pay scales of the Primary school teachers?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I do not share the view of the hon. Member. Most of the State Governments have participated in the scheme of the Central Government with regard to relief for the educated unemployed by the starting of one-teacher schools.

Appendix 5
Document No. 39

**Answers¹ of Dr. K.L. Shrimali, the Parliamentary Secretary of
Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, to questions asked in Council of
States (Rajya Sabha) about the Fulbright Scheme
on 26-8-1954**

Shri D. Narayan: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indians who have so far been granted scholarships under the "Fulbright Scheme" since its inception;

(b) the number of Americans who have come to India under the scheme during the same period; and

(c) whether Government share any expenditure in respect of the scholars who have been granted scholarships under this scheme?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali) (a) 483, as far as Government are aware.

(b) 195, as far as Government are aware.

(c) No.

Appendix 6

Document No. 40

Motion for election to the Court of the Banaras Hindu University and Programme of Election Thereto¹

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): Sir, I beg to move:

“That in pursuance of item (xvii) of clause (1) of Statute 14 of the revised Statutes of the Banaras Hindu University, this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Court of the Banaras Hindu University for a period of five years *vice* Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, who retired from the membership of the Council of States on the 2nd April 1954, and ceased to be a member of the Court of the Banaras Hindu University with effect from that date.”

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The question is:

“That in pursuance of item (xvii) of clause (1) of Statute 14 of the revised Statutes of the Banaras Hindu University, this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Court of the Banaras Hindu University for a period of five years *vice* Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, who retired from the membership of the Council of States on the 2nd April 1954, and ceased to be a member of the Court of the Banaras Hindu University with effect from that date.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I have to inform hon. Members that the 3rd September 1954, has been fixed as the last date for receiving nominations, and the 6th September 1951, for holding elections, if necessary, to the Court of the Banaras Hindu University.

The nominations will be received in the Rajya Sabha Notice Office upto 12 noon on the 3rd September. The elections, which will be

conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, will, if necessary, be held in Secretary's room (Room No. 29) Ground Floor, Parliament House, between the hours of 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. on the 6th September.²

1. Moved on 1-9-1954 on behalf of Maulana Azad by his Parliamentary Secretary in Rajya Sabha.
2. See next Appendix.

Appendix 7

Document No. 41

Election to the Court of the Banaras Hindu University¹

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, being the only candidate nominated for election to the Court of the Banaras Hindu University, I hereby declare him to be duly elected to be a member of the said Court.

1. Dated 14.2.1954

Appendix 8

Document No. 42

Answers of the Parliamentary Secretary¹ to the Minister of Education² to questions asked in Rajya Sabha dated 14-9-1954 on behalf of the latter

INTERNATIONAL TEAM OF EDUCATIONISTS ON SECONDARY EDUCATION

Shri H.C. Mathur: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the team of foreign and Indian educationists deputed to make a detailed and comparative study of the secondary education system in the country has submitted its reports; and

(b) if so, what are the principal recommendations made by it and what steps have been taken by Government to implement those recommendations?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a) Yes.

(b) Attention of the hon. Member is invited to the publication entitled "Teachers and Curricula in Secondary Schools – Report of a study by an International Team", copies of which are available in the Parliament Library. The Report forms part of the data on the basis of which proposals for the reconstruction of secondary education have been and are being worked out.

Shri H.C. Mathur: What are the principal recommendations of this Committee and what principal recommendations and conclusions have been accepted by Government?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: This International Team had to work within the general framework of the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission. They have made certain specific recommendations both for the improvement of the teachers and curricula in secondary schools.

The recommendations will be considered at the next meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education and then they will be considered by the Government of India.

Shri H.C. Mathur: When were these recommendations made? I only wanted to know what are the principal recommendations.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Committee surveyed the whole field of secondary education and the whole report consists of over 100 pages and it will take some time if I have to relate them here. I will refer my hon. friend to the report itself which is available in the Library.

Prof. R.D. Sinha Dinkar: Have they recommended the bifurcation of arts and science?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: They have agreed with the report of the Secondary Education Commission with regard to diversification of courses.

Prof. R.D. Sinha Dinkar: Do Government know that a very large number of village schools are not equipped with science appliances?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Government are aware of this situation.

Prof. R.D. Sinha Dinkar: Do Government want that the students coming from the village schools should not join I.Sc.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No. The position is that the Secondary Education Commission was fully aware of the defects in the present system of education and one of the important recommendations which the Secondary Education Commission made was that the Government should establish multi-purpose schools particularly in the rural areas and I think the whole scheme is being worked out and we hope that some schools will be established by next July.

Prof. R.D. Sinha Dinkar: I want to know if the Government are prepared to safeguard the interests and prospects of the boys coming from the village schools who are not given admission into the science colleges?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes Sir, Government are fully conscious of the problem and it is the policy of the Government to establish more and more schools in the rural areas. It is only in this way that we can safeguard the interests of these pupils from the rural areas.

Shri B.C. Ghosh: May I know Sir, why after the Secondary Education Commission had reported it was considered necessary by Government to invite a team of foreign experts to traverse the same field over again?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The curricula and the courses in the secondary stage had to be worked out in greater detail. Therefore, this Committee prepared a more detailed report on some aspects of Secondary Education than the Secondary Education Commission.

Shri B.C. Ghosh: Is it the presumption that these foreign experts knew more about our curricula than the persons who were on the Secondary Education Commission?

Prof. G. Ranga: Somebody seems to have got a stomach-ache.

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: We take advantage of the experience of people in other countries also.

1. Dr. K.L. Shrimali.
2. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Appendix 9

Document No. 43

Answers' of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad dated 14-9-1954 to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha

NATIONAL CENTRE FOR FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

Shri Govinda Reddy: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to set up a National Centre for Fundamental Education;

(b) if so, what are the outlines of the proposal; and

(c) what is the estimated expenditure involved?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha

Statement

(b) The Centre will provide an institutional nucleus and a forum for the discussion of various problems that arise in the field of fundamental education, to train workers not only for the community projects areas or the national extension organisations but also organisers to take charge of social education work in the various States as part of their general education programme. The functions of the Centre may be summarised thus:

- (i) the training of higher personnel;
- (ii) the preparation of audio-visual aids;
- (iii) the preparation of reading materials of superior quality;

(iv) the handling of research investigations into problems arising in the course of field work.

(c) The exact financial implications have not been worked out but the recurring and non-recurring expenditure is likely to be about Rs. 6,00,000.

Shri Govinda Reddy: May I know whether this scheme is in accordance with the scheme of the UNESCO?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Very much on the lines envisaged by UNESCO.

Shri Govinda Reddy: Is it a fact that UNESCO has sent in a draft scheme to the Government of India?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir, they did not send in any draft schemes. The whole plan of fundamental education was worked at the sixth general conference of UNESCO and the idea was to establish a network of fundamental education centres to make a world-wide drive against illiteracy and low living standards.

Shri V.K. Dhage: What is fundamental education, Sir?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The idea of fundamental education arose in UNESCO; it is a special word used by UNESCO. It is a very comprehensive word which not only means removal of illiteracy but also the education of the people in citizenship. It is very much like that we call social education in our country.

Shri Govinda Reddy: May I know whether it is true that UNESCO offered financial assistance for States which were ready to work this scheme?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir, that was the original idea.

Shri Govinda Reddy: May I know whether any financial assistance has been received?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir. UNESCO later on withdrew the offer of assistance.

Shri Govinda Reddy: Is the reply to say that UNESCO withdrew the offer?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir.

Shri Govinda Reddy: Is it not a fact that UNESCO has offered to other States?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir, the whole scheme was withdrawn, as far as I am aware.

Shri Govinda Reddy: May I know whether the Government of India have decided where to establish this centre?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Yes, Sir; it will be located at Delhi.

Shri H.P. Saksena: Why are the Government of India pursuing this scheme which has been dropped and withdrawn by UNESCO?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Because we think that it is very important and will benefit our people.

Appendix 10

Document No. 44

**Answers of Parliamentary Secretary, on behalf of
Maulana Azad, dated 14-9-1954 to the
questions asked in Rajya Sabha**

DELEGATION TO THE EIGHTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

Shri Govinda Reddy: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state the personnel and other particulars of the delegation proposed to be sent to the Eighth General Conference of UNESCO to be held at Montevideo this year?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): A Statement is placed on the Table of the House.

Statement

The Indian Delegation to the Eighth General Conference of UNESCO will consist of nine members as follows:

Delegates

- (1) Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President of India (*Leader*).
- (2) Dr. A.L. Mudaliar, Vice-Chancellor, Madras University.
- (3) Shri Humayun Kabir, Secretary, Ministry of Education.
- (4) Dr. B.N. Prasad, General Secretary, Indian Science Congress Association, Allahabad.
- (5) Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale, M.P.

Alternates

- (6) Shri A.R. Wadia, M.P. Director, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay.
- (7) Shri M. Mujeeb, Vice-Chancellor, Jamia Millia Islamia.

Appendix 11

Document No. 45

Answers¹ of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education, questions² asked in Lok Sabha on 20-9-1954 in in Connection with Scholarships³

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) Forty-nine.

(b) Three scholarships have been granted to scholars who will study:

- (i) Theoretical Physics – Field Theory and Nuclear Forces;
- (ii) Meson Theory and Nuclear Forces;
- (iii) Geophysics.

Further answers to the supply. questions:

1. **Dr. M.M. Das:** These scholarships were reserved for candidates of Parts C and D States. No separate reservation was made within this reservation for Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes.

2. **Dr. M.M. Das:** Applications received were: Delhi 17, Cutch 5, Himachal Pradesh 3, Tripura 2, Vindhya Pradesh 7, Coorg 2, Ajmer 12, Andaman and Nicobar Islands 1. As the scholarships were to be awarded on merit, no separate census or account was taken of scholars belonging to Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes.

3. **Dr. M.M. Das:** All the scholarships are advertised.

Shri Radha Raman: What is the total amount sanctioned for these scholarships and what is the amount in each case?

Dr. M.M. Das: The scholarships under this scheme are tenable for a maximum period of three years, and their value is \$1500 *per annum* in the U.S.A. and £360 to £400 *per annum* in the United Kingdom.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether these scholarships are granted directly by the Central Government or by any foundations or institutions abroad?

Dr. M.M. Das: They are given directly by the Central Government.

1. On behalf of Maulana Azad
2. By Mr. Naval Prabhakar
3. Mr. Prabhakar asked certain questions in Hindi language about several Scholarships.

Appendix 12

Document No. 46

Answers' of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education to the questions asked in Lok Sabha

(1)

NATIONAL LIBRARY²

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state whether there are any rules prescribed for the recruitment and promotion of staff at the National Library at Calcutta?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): Draft rules have been framed and these are being finalized in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs and Union Public Service Commission. In the meantime the draft rules are being followed.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: Has it come to the notice of Government that in the matter of appointments and promotions, the Public Service Commission regulations are often ignored and persons even without the qualifications advertised for are appointed by the Librarian?

Dr. M.M. Das: As I said, the draft rules have not yet been finalized. They are to be finalized in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Union Public Service Commission.

Shri H.N. Mukerjee: Pending the finalization of the draft rules, is Government aware that there is considerable dissatisfaction among the present members of the staff on account of the allegedly discriminatory practices by the Librarian?

Dr. M.M. Das: Government has no knowledge about the dissatisfaction of the staff. But I must submit for the satisfaction of the hon. Member that during the last few years we have appointed only one Class I Officer, and the appointment has been made through the Union Public Service Commission. So far as Class II Officers are concerned,

1. On behalf of Maulana Azad on 20.9.1954.

2. Of Calcutta.

seven have been appointed, two permanently through the Union Public Service Commission, and five temporarily by promotion. Promotion has been given to the employees of the Department, and those employees who have got these temporary promotions are the seniormost men in the Department. So far as Class III appointments are concerned they are made by the Council of the Library where there are members nominated by the Calcutta University, the West Bengal Government and the Central Government.

(2)

LINGUISTIC SURVEY

Shri Sanganna: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether any steps have been taken for a new linguistic survey of India in pursuance of the recommendations made by the Standing Committee appointed in May 1953 by the Conference of Linguists and Educationists; and

(b) if so, what is the progress in this regard?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) and (b) A definite scheme is still awaited.

Shri Sanganna: May I know the various recommendations made by the Standing Committee appointed by the Conference of Linguists and Educationists?

Dr. M.M. Das: The Conference of Linguists and Educationists was a non-official Conference, and the Committee was also non-official. Linguistic survey was one of the recommendations concerning the Ministry of Education. The recommendation is that a new linguistic survey of India should be undertaken on all-India level, the direction and organisation of which should preferably be in the hands of a non-official academic expert committee preferably centred in the Deccan College.

Shri Sanganna: May I know the agency through which the linguistic survey is taken?

Dr. M.M. Das: We have not yet received any complete concrete scheme from the Deccan College Post-graduate Research Institute.

Shri S.N. Das: May I know whether Government had asked for any scheme or whether it depends upon the organisation to give any scheme?

Dr. M.M. Das: The approach was made on behalf of that organisation first. So we have asked that organisation to send to us a concrete, well thought-out plan.

Sardar A.S. Saigal: What is meant by linguistic survey, and how many such surveys have been made in the past?

Dr. M.M. Das: My knowledge about this technical subject is in no way better than that of the hon. Member. But I understand by linguistic survey we mean the study of the relation between different languages with regard to their origin, their construction, their grammar, the area in which the language is spoken and the people, the particular communities which speak that language. There had not been many surveys made. Only one was made by a European scholar about fifty years back.

Appendix 13

Document No. 47

Answers' dated 20-9-1954 of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha

SCOUT ORGANISATION

Shri S.V. Ramaswamy: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether any amount has been specifically set apart for the development of the Scout Organisation in India;

(b) whether any State-wise contribution to the Scout Organisation is being made; and

(c) whether the Scout Organisation has been utilised in any manner for the implementation of the Five Year Plan?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) No.

(b) No.

(c) It is reported that the scout organisation has been utilised in rendering service in Festivals, Relief Camps and National Programmes as provided in the Five Year Plan.

Shri S.V. Ramaswamy: The N.C.C. was utilised for clearing of certain canals and construction of roads. Has any such assignment been given to the scout organisation anywhere in India?

Dr. M.M. Das: The scout organisation is a non-official organisation, and these details are not with me at present.

Shri S.V. Ramaswamy: Have representations been made that the scout organisation is not able to reach up to its full utility for want of funds?

Dr. M.M. Das: This year a request has been made by the Bharat Scouts and Guides for a grant-in-aid of Rs. 75,000. In addition, a special grant of Rs. 60,000 is requested for the establishment of an all-India training centre for organising advanced training camps of an all-India character for Scouts and Guides officers.

Sardar A.S. Saigal: Is it a fact that there are different scout organisations in the country and may I know what amount of grant was paid to them last year?

Dr. M.M. Das: In the year 1949-50, there were three different scout organisations. Fortunately for us, they have merged together to form one organisation, namely the Bharat Scouts and Guides. During 1953-54 we gave this organisation a grant of Rs. 32,500.

Appendix 14

Document No. 48

Replies' of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad to questions asked in Rajya Sabha on 21-9-1954

APPOINTMENT OF A FOREIGN SPECIALIST AT THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE

Shri N.C. Sekhar: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether a foreign specialist has been appointed to the post of professor and head of Department of Chemical Technology and Chemical Engineering at the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore; and

(b) if so, what are his nationally, qualifications, previous experience and terms of appointment?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a) Yes.

(b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 123]

Shri N.C. Sekhar: May I know the duration of his appointment?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, it is given in the statement. He is appointed on probation for a period of two years, after which, if confirmed, to continue in the post till he attains the age of sixty years and for such further period as may be necessary.

Shri N.C. Sekhar: May I know whether he was employed in any other country in this capacity?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: A full statement of his previous experience is given in the statement.

Shri N.C. Sekhar: Has he connection with any other firm?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I am not aware of his connection with any other firm.

Appendix 15

Document No. 49

Answers' dated 21-9-1954, of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Rajya Sabha

SETTING UP OF A MATCH FACTORY IN DELHI

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Will the Minister for Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Social Welfare Board propose to set up a Match Factory in Delhi;

(b) if so, whether applications have been invited from women for part-time employment in that factory;

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, how many women have so far applied; and

(d) how many persons are expected to be employed in that factory?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education (Dr. K.L. Shrimali): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c) No applications have been invited as such, but the Board has set up a Family Welfare Advisory Committee which has made a house to house survey in the West Patel Nagar, Moti Nagar and Ramesh Nagar areas, and registered about one thousand families for the purposes of providing part-time jobs in the match factory.

(d) About 500 women.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Before this proposal was taken up, did the Government investigate the position in Tamil Nadu where this is already existing as a cottage industry?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: No, Sir. I am not aware of any investigation having been made in Tamil Nadu. This project is meant for Delhi.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Are the Government aware that in

Ramnad and other districts where there is already this industry, it is cracking up as a result of the big Wimco factory competing with it?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: This project has been taken up as an experimental measure and I am sure the Government will take up many more projects like this if it becomes successful.

Shri P.C. Bhanj Deo: May I know whether this match factory will be run on a self-supporting basis?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: This is a co-operative society of the beneficiaries themselves. The Government are giving it a loan and also some grant.

Shri P. Sundarayya: Is there any proposal to start a match factory on similar lines in Ramnadi in Tamil Nadu?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I have already said this project has been started by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce along with the Social Welfare Board and I am sure many more such projects will be taken up in course of time.

Shri P. Sundarayya: Is it not necessary that first priority should be given to this cottage industry before it gets extinguished completely and efforts should be made to safeguard this cottage industry?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: Sir, as I said, this project has been taken up by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce and as far as I know, they will examine this question.

Shri R.U. Agnibhoj: Will the Government see that this industry does not collapse due to competition from other mechanised industrial establishments?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: I think the Ministry of Commerce and Industry will take proper care about that.

Shri H.P. Saksena: When the Central Social Welfare Board people visited different houses and made a house to house survey, did they visit the *bastis* occupied by low-class people as they are generally known?

Dr. K.L. Shrimali: The Social Welfare Board surveyed about a thousand families and these families lived in the areas of West Patel Nagar, Moti Nagar and Ramesh Nagar and the income group to which these families belonged was between Rs. 60 to Rs. 250.

Appendix 16

Document No. 50

Answers' of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Lok Sabha on 23-9-1954

PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND SOCIAL EDUCATION CENTRES

Shri D.C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of single-teacher primary schools and social education centres that the Punjab Government plan to open with the help of the grants sanctioned by the Government of India; and

(b) the number of such schools and social education centres opened so far and the number of teachers appointed therein?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) 4,300 single teacher Primary Schools and 220 Social Education Centres.

(b) (i) 2,400 single teacher schools and 100 Social Education Centres opened so far.

(ii) 2,400 teachers and 100 social education workers appointed so far.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know whether these single-teacher schools are confined mainly to the backward areas of Punjab?

Dr. M.M. Das: These places or sites were selected by the State Government, so far as I know.

Shri D.C. Sharma: May I know out of the Social Education Centres established, how many are in rural areas?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I might invite the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that this question was allowed, though it related to

the details of administration with the State Government, because he wanted to have information as to how many schools and Social Education Centres were carried on with the help of grants sanctioned by the Government of India. So, it is only in respect of that particular information that he can put questions; he should not go into details.

Shri D.C. Sharma: All right. May I know whether the grant is to be given only for one year or it is to be spread over five or ten years?

Dr. M.M. Das: These schemes are extended up till March 1955, *i.e.* only the present year of the Plan period. But the Centre's contribution will continue upto 1956-57.

Appendix 17

Document No. 51

Answers¹ dated 23-9-1954, of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Lok Sabha

STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Shri S.N. Das: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the scheme for encouraging the study abroad of foreign languages by Indian nationals has been finalised; and

(b) if so, what are the important features of the scheme?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement giving the relevant information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 21.]

Shri S.N. Das: From the list, it appears that for the study of Arabic and Russian, the countries chosen for study are Egypt and Lebanon, and U.K., France and Germany. I would like to know the reason why the country of those languages have not been selected.

Dr. M.M. Das: So far as Arabic is concerned, the facilities for teaching Arabic are better in Egypt and Lebanon than in Arabia itself.

So far as the Russian language is concerned, the reasons are the following: (i) overcrowding in Russian Universities, and difficulty in getting admission there, (ii) there being no special courses for foreigners as in other countries, and the usual courses for Russians being for a period of three years, which cannot ordinarily be followed by our scholars, as the scholarships are only for one year's duration.

Shri S.N. Das: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has stated that there is overcrowding in Russian Universities. May I know whether there has been any correspondence with the Government of the U.S.S.R. for the admission of Indian students there?

Dr. M.M. Das: I am not at the present moment aware of any correspondence, but the said informations are with us at our disposal, and the information facts are correct.

Shri S.N. Das: May I know whether any estimate of personnel having knowledge of foreign languages is available, and if so, what is that number? What is the number that is required for our universities and certain services in the Central Government?

Dr. M.M. Das: That has not yet been determined, so far as I know.

Shri G.P. Sinha: May I know whether it is necessary to send students abroad to learn foreign languages, the facilities for which are sufficient in this country as in the case of Arabic, Persian and other subjects?

Dr. M.M. Das: This scheme is meant for special knowledge in those languages, and the candidates that are selected are required to study to the uppermost level – I mean the educational level – in these languages for which facilities are available in this country.

Appendix 18

Document No. 52

**Answers' of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad
dated 23-9-1954 to the questions asked in Lok Sabha**

WELFARE EXTENSION PROJECTS

Shri K.P. Sinha: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of "Welfare Extension Projects" already started and the places where they have been started; and

(b) the method adopted in making the selection for the location of these Welfare Extension Projects?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) A statement showing the places of these projects is attached. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 22.]

(b) The State Welfare Advisory Boards set up Implementation Committees which survey local conditions, and in the light of urgent needs of the localities, recommend where Welfare Extension Projects should be started.

Shri K.P. Sinha: May I know the number of projects that are going to be covered in one State, and the expenses thereon?

Dr. M.M. Das: The number of projects that are expected to be taken up all over the country is one per district, *i.e.* 352 in the whole of the country.

What is the second part of the question?

Shri K.P. Sinha: The expenses thereon.

Dr. M.M. Das: The cost will be on an average Rs. 50,000 per project till the end of the Plan period.

Shri K.P. Sinha: May I know the tests of efficiency, so far as the social organisations are concerned, to whom the task is going to be entrusted?

Dr. M.M. Das: We consult the State Advisory Board in this matter, and the tests of efficiency are their work.

Shri Thimmaiah: May I know whether any Welfare Extension Projects will be opened on the day of Gandhi Jayanti?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am going to the next question now.

Shri M.L. Dwivedi: May I put one question? This question stands in my name also. I also want to ask one supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, he may put one.

Shri M.L. Dwivedi: I want to know what the aims and objects of the scheme are.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is too general and wide a question.

Document No. 53

**Answers' dated 23-9-1954, of the Parliamentary Secretary
of Maulana Azad to questions asked in the House
of People about a visit of Dr. Peter**

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das) : (a) Yes.

(b) Dr. Peter Manniche visited 18 Institutions and recommended the establishment of a People's Institute, a People's College and a Training College for teachers in Adult Education.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know whether the Danish Doctor was invited by the Government of India and if so, what is the expenditure incurred by the Government?

Dr. M.M. Das: He was invited by the Government of India and the total expenditure incurred was Rs. 1,900.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know how many States he visited?

Dr. M.M. Das: I have got a detailed list. He visited about 18 institutions in different States.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury: May I know in which States these institutions have been put up and his recommendations put into force.

Dr. M.M. Das: No decision has been taken about his recommendations.

Appendix 20

Document No. 54

Answers' of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Lok Sabha on 23-9-1954

DISPLACED STUDENTS IN MANIPUR

Shri Rishang Keishing: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of displaced students in Manipur who have been awarded scholarships so far by the Government under their Rehabilitation Schemes;

(b) the amount of money placed at the disposal of the State Government so far for such scholarships; and

(c) the basis on which these scholarships are awarded?

These Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M.M. Das): (a) 462.

(b) In 1953-54 – Rs. 9,496.

(In 1954-55 April 1954 to August 1954) – Rs. 5,000

(c) A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 25.]

Shri Rishang Keishing: May I know when this scheme for financial assistance to displaced students and trainees from Pakistan was passed on to the State Government of Manipur, and since when this scheme was given effect to?

Dr. M.M. Das: I think the scheme was given effect to in Manipur in the year 1951-52. But I am not prepared to commit myself.

Shri Rishang Keishing: Is it not a fact that in spite of repeated requests from displaced persons and reminders from the Central

Government, the State Government delayed the implementation of the scheme and if so, the reasons therefor?

Mr. Speaker: Did he not catch the question?

Dr. M.M. Das: I have understood the question, but we have got no information about it.

Document No. 55

Answers¹ of the Parliamentary Secretary of Maulana Azad to the questions asked in Lok Sabha by Mr. Ramaswami on 23-9-1954 in connection with the development of libraries

Dr. M.M. Das: There are two schemes for the development of libraries so far as the States are concerned. In one of the schemes, we have asked the State Governments to develop the Central libraries.

Shri M.D. Ramaswami: May I know whether this grant is in addition to the library cess collected by the Madras State?

Dr. M.M. Das: Regarding the total grant given to the Madras State I can give the figures year by year.

Shri D.C. Sharma: Is this grant meant for a particular library at a particular place or is the State at liberty to disburse the grant in any way it likes?

Dr. M.M. Das: There are two schemes under the Five Year Plan of the Education Ministry. One is the integrated library service in an area selected for intensive educational development. It is the integrated scheme for the development of social and basic education along with the development of libraries. In the second scheme, improvement of libraries in general for the State as a whole is the objective.

Who's Who

- Ali Naqi Khan** : The Wazir of Oudh who took part actively in the conspiracy against the rulers; was a henchman of the East India Company; was used by the Britishers to persuade Wafid Ali Shah to give up his kingdom voluntarily.
- Bajirao** : An import figure of the revolt against the British Government in 1857.
- Desai, Khandubhai** : A prominent Congress leader from Gujarat and Member of Parliament (1952-57).
- Faruqi, M** : Veteran Communist leader, freedom fighter and ex-Member of Parliament.
- Gadgil, Narhar Vishnu** : Top-ranking Congress leader and Gandhian thinker, was a Minister in the Union Cabinet, headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (1947-52), was elected to the first Lok Sabha from Poona (1952), was appointed Governor of Punjab in 1958.
- Humayun Kabir** : A nearest friend of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, was appointed State Minister in his Council of Ministers in 1959 by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.
- Kripalani, Sucheta** : A prominent Congress worker of U.P.; was elected to the first Lok Sabha (1952); became Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh in 1966.
- Mukherjee, Ashutosh** : An eminent scholar, who put India on the research map of the world; was a Judge in the High Court of Calcutta; took keen interest in the development of Calcutta University.

Glossary

Acharya	: Teacher, word used for the Chancellor of Viswa Bharti University, Shantiniketan.
Dargah	: Tomb of a Muslim Saint.
Devanagri	: Script adopted for Sanskrit, Hindi and some other languages in India
Haj	: Pilgrimage to Mecca to offer prayer
Jagirdari	: Land-holding
Khwaja	: Muslim Mystic
Maqbara	: Tomb
Taluka	: Sub-division

Chronology of Events (1955)

- | | | |
|-----------|----|--|
| January | 12 | : Addressed the Twenty-second Conference of the Central Advisory Board of Education in New Delhi. |
| January | 25 | : Delivered Presidential speech at the 31st session of the Indian Historical Records Commission in Mysore. |
| February | 28 | : Clarified the position of work of UNESCO Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research in Rajya Sabha. |
| April | 29 | : Clarified the position in the House of People regarding the University Grants Commission. |
| September | 6 | : Clarified the position in connection with the loans given by the Ministry of Education in the Council of States. |

Index

A

Abdulbhai, Mulla, 99
Aberdeen, 68
Achuthan, 117, 167, 177, 179, 235
Agra, 40, 134
Ahmedabad, 40
Aid to Universities of Britain, 76
Ajmer-Merwara, 22
Algurai, 95, 96, 99
Aligarh University, 5
Ali Naqi Khan, 15
America, 92, 138
Americans, 5
Anand, J.S.; 34, 40
Andhra, 22, 178, 197
Animal Ecology, 24
Annie Mascarane, 94
Arabic, 19, 106
Arid Zone Programme, 8, 23, 24
Arundelkar, Rukmini Devi, 311
Assam, 22
Ashutosh Mukherjee, 103
Atlekar, 130, 290
Avinashilingham, T.S., 99, 108
Avurvedic University of Jhansi, 170
Azad, Abul Kalam, 1, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 84, 99, 214, 295, 301, 307, 313, 314, 317, 319, 320, 321, 322, 324, 326, 328, 331; address at, 1; in, 12; Minister of

Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research, 27, 28, 29, 32, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 47, 48; Occupies a great place in Political history, 83.

Azamgarh, 95

B

Basic Education, 43
Bahadur Singh, 294, 295
Bajirao, 15
Banaras Hindu University, 5
Banerjee, B.C., 34
Barrow, 75
Bashiruddin, 34
Basu, K.K., 117, 161, 166, 177, 204, 229, 242
Basu, P.C., 34
Bengali, 106
Bhatnagar, S.S., 5, 70
Bhopal, 22
Bihar, 22
Biology, 24
Birbalsingh, 99
Bodra, T., 52
Bombay, 20, 22; University, 83, 154
Bristol, 68
British, 11
British Government, 15; Universities, 67
Butler, 150
Bureau of Vocational and Educational Guidance, 4

C

Calcutta, 101; Museum, 32; University, 84
 Cambridge, 104, 105
 Canning, Lord, 12
 Central Advisory Board of Education, 1
 Central Government, 4, 5
 Central Museum, 32
 Central Scheme, 2
 Chancellor, 65
 Chapatis, 14
 Chauhan, N.S., 51
 Chaudhary, N.B., 28, 32, 83, 86
 Chaudhary, T.K., 31
 Chettiar, T.S.A., 135, 137, 139, 141, 142, 165, 213, 215, 221, 225, 226, 230, 231, 232, 248, 259
 Chirayinkil, 192
 Cinderella, 104
 Coimbatore, 39
 Columbia University, 118
 Concurrent list, 90
 Coorg, 22
 Council of Secondary Education, 4
 Council of Technical Education, 4, 5
 Cranganur, 117
 Crimea, 15
 Crown, 16
 Cuarow Wadia Institute, Poona, 40
 Cuttack, 40

D

Daily Yuganhar, 32
 Dalhousie, Lord, 11, 15
 Dange, V.K., 310
 Das, B.K. 217, 278, 289
 Dashrathdev, 28

Das, K, 219

Das, M.M. 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 53, 58, 70, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 96, 99, 100, 104, 119, 124, 142, 157, 182, 184, 185, 187, 191, 192, 203, 207, 208, 210, 211, 213, 214, 215, 217, 219, 220, 222, 226, 227, 239, 244, 255, 258, 263, 265, 266, 276, 284, 285, 289, 290, 313.

Das, S.N., 35, 92, 96

Dean of Columbia University, 119

Delhi, 22, 32

Delhi University, 5

Deo, R.N.S., 99

Desai, K.R., 34

Dev, P.C.B., 321

Dhulekar, R.V.; 98, 124, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176.

Dineshchandra (Sarkar), 34

Dinkar, R.D.S., 306

Divanchand, 99

Diwani Rights, 17

Drugs, 54

Dube, Mulchand, 127, 273

Dube, R.P. 26

E

East India Company, 128

East-North, 101

Ecology, 24

Education Commission, 2, 3

Education Secretaries, 3

Elura, 106

Emperor of Delhi, 17

England, 109, 138

English, 64

Ernakulam, 55

Establishment of U.G.C., 58

Europe, 5

European, 12

Exchange of Persons Programme,
49

Executive, 57

F

Farrukhabad, 127

Faruqi, M., 45, 52, 53

Federation of Educational
Associations, 46

Fellowship Scheme, 48

Ferozepur, 296

Financing and Control of University
Education, 109

Five Year Plan, 26

France, 74, 148

Freedom, 104

Foreign Governments, 42; languages,
148

Fund for the Commission, 81

G

Gadgil, Narhar Vishnu, 98

Gallery of Modern Art, 7

Ganamukhi Parishad, 28

Gandhi, M.K., 9, 10

Gandhi, V.B., 98, 161, 163, 164, 166,
167

German, 21

Ghosh, B.C., 308

Gidwani, 96

Glasgow, 68

God, 159

Gopalrao, 196

Government of India, 2, 3, 6, 7, 26,
31, 35, 37, 56, 141; 213

Governor General, 17; in Council,
59

Great Britain, 77

Great Men of Learning, 76

Gurkul University of Kangri, 174

Gupta, S.D., 34

Gurgaon, 118

Gurupadaswamy, M.S., 87, 88, 160,
202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 230, 237,
249, 250, 251, 252, 279

Gwalior, 40

H

Hastings, Lord, 17

Hindi, 106, national language, 66

Hindi Exhibition, 47

Hitler, 150

Hooghly, 39

Hoshiarpur, 150, 204

House of Commons, 14

Human Ecology, 24

Humayun Kabir, 311

Hydrogeology, 24

Hydrology, 24

Hyderabad, 22

I

Incharge of Honours Education, 105

Income tax, 109

India, 1, 20, 74, 141, 153

Indian, 13

Indian Army, 11; King 12

Indian Independence, 11

Indian heritage, 6

Indian Nations, 41

Indian Office in London, 13

Indian States, 11

Indore, 40

Industrial Cooperation Scheme, 21

Itachura, 39

J

Jadhavpur, 40

Jaipal Singh, 99, 145

Jaipur, 134

Jaswant College, 24, 25

Jayshri, S., 154

Jaysoorya, 156, 157

Jhansi, 170

Jodhpur, 23, 24

Joshi, J.H., 97; K.A., 98, 328

Joshi, M.D., 61, 62, 63

Judge of High Court, 103

Jhunjhunwala, 278

K

Kamath, H.V., 277

Karaikudi, 40

Kee Shing, R., 329

Keshavdeo Malaviya, 294

Kharagpur, 170

Khardekar, B.H., 99

Kingdom, 17

Kripalani, Sucheta, 67, 73

Krishnagiri, 167

Krishnaswami, 78, 79, 89

Kutch, 22

L

Lad, P.M. 70

Lal, Bansi, 134

Language, 64

Lanka Sundaram, 79

Latin America, 109

Legislation, 51

Lingam, N.M.; 96

Loan Educational Exchange
Programme, 34

Local Education, 77

Lonawala, 37

London, 15, 16

Lt. Governor, 18

Lucknow, 40

Ludhiana, 296

M

Madras, 20, 22, 139; University, 83

Madhya Pradesh, 22; Bharat, 22

Manipur, 22

Matthan, 145

Meghanand, 145

Mehta, Narsi, 131

Metcaff, 14

Middle East, 5

Mines and Minerals, 50

Mirza Mohiuddin, 13

Mirza, Lingraj, 98

M. Mujeeb, 311

Moghul Emperor, 17

More, S.S., 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63,
72, 90, 94, 95, 113, 118, 122, 124,
125, 127, 129, 134

Mudaliar, A.L., 311; Commission, 3

Mukharjee, Ashutosh, 103

Mukharjee, H.N., 31, 98, 101, 104,
106, 108, 122, 186, 272, 314

Munshi Azimulla Khan, 15, 16

Murthy, B.S., 101

Musafir, G.S., 99

Mysore, 22, 76

N

Nabadwip, 118

Nabi Ahmed, 34

Nadia, 39

Nagpur, 40

Nanarao, 15

Nandalal, 127, 153, 160

Napolean, 12

Narasimhan, C.R., 170

Narayandas, 222, 223, 224, 229, 249,
250, 262, 278

National Archives, 13

National Education Society, 39
 National Feeling, 13
 Nawab of Arcot, 17; Murshidabad, 17
 Nayar, V.P., 164, 193, 194, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 224, 227, 228, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 244, 248, 249, 253
 N.C. Chatterjee, 166, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189.
 Nehru, J.L., 132
 New Statesman, 109, 110, 111
 Nityananda Vidyaratana, 39
 Nirukta, 132
 Nizam of Hyderabad, 17
 Nobel Prize, 68
 Northern Indian, 13
 North-West Frontier Province, 18

O

Official Gazette, 171
 Omar Pasha, 15, 16
 Organisations as the inter-Universities Board, 102
 Orissa, 22, 110.
 Osmania University of Hyderabad, 198
 Oudh, 12
 Oxford, 104, 105, 144, 147, 152

P

Pakistan, 41
 Palchowdhary, Ila, 118
 Palli Niketan, 39
 Parganas, 39
 Parihat, 39
 Parvathi Krishnan, 320
 Peking, 109
 Persian, 18, 19, 106

PEPSU, 20, 22
 Pot of Jam, 56
 Prabhakar, Naval, 313
 Prasad, B.N., 311
 Principal of College, 36
 Punjab, 20, 22

Q

Queens College of Banaras, 170
 Quinquennial Conference, 56

R

Rachiah, N., 98, 127
 Radhakrishnan, S., 86, 311;
 Commission, 62, 77
 Radha Raman, 313
 Rajabhoj, P.N., 98
 Rajasthan, 22
 Ramabhadram, S. 34
 Ranga, N.G., 307
 Rangu Bapu, 15
 Rao, M.V.R., 34
 Ratnagiri, 61
 Reddy, B.R., 99; Govinda, 308, 309
 Reddy, R.R., 257, 262, 263, 264, 265
 Reddy, T.N.V., 98
 Regional languages, 116
 Renu Chakravarthy, 295
 R.M. Sahu, 98
 Royal Botanical Garden, 68
 Ruler, 16
 Rural Education, 150
 Ruskin, 68

S

Sabha, Rajya, 26
 Sagar, 120
 Saha, M., 99
 Sahay, S.N., 98, 110, 113, 114

Samantha, S.C., 27, 32, 33, 38
 Sangama, 29, 36
 Saurashtra, 22
 Saxena, H.P., 310, 321
 Scheduled Tribes, 9
 Scholarships, 36
 Senate of Calcutta University, 103
 Sen, S.N. 12, 19
 Sen, Sushama, 55
 Sharma, A.N., 34
 Singh, Raghubir, 48, 293
 Singh, Ramnarayan, 37, 90, 184, 190, 210
 Singh, Ram Subhag, 30, 31, 161, 284
 Singh, T.N., 253, 277, 278, 283, 284, 288, 289
 Sinha, G.P., 325
 Sinha, K.P., 326, 327
 Sinha, S., 98
 Shrimali, K.L., 107, 171, 173, 266, 280, 285, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 305, 307, 310, 311, 319, 320, 321
 Sodhia, K.C., 121, 228, 244, 262, 267, 268, 289
 Sundarayya, P., 298, 299, 300, 321
 Suresh Chandra, 96, 125, 126, 153, 161, 193, 210, 211
 Swamy, Shivamurthi, 98
 Sword of Damocles, 82

T

Taherati Mulla, 98
 Talkatora Gardens, 7
 Taluqdars, 12; of Oudh, 12
 Tamilnadu, 192
 Tek Chand, 145, 147, 155
 Thakurdas Bhargava, 118, 259, 268, 269, 270, 272, 281

Thana, 95
 Thomas, A.M., 55, 56, 98
 Tirrupur, 135
 Travancore-Cochin, 22
 Tribal Education, 28
 Tripura, 22
 Tripura Government, 28
 Trivedi, U.M., 107, 161, 166, 171
 Trivandrum, 94
 Trueman, A.E., 68
 Tukaram, 131
 Tulsidas, 131

U

Udaipur, 39
 U.E.C., 203, 204
 U.G.C., 5, 30, 89, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 170, 171, 178, 180, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 199, 200, 201, 208, 209, 211, 215, 218, 222, 230, 234, 235, 237, 247, 248, 256, 278
 Ujjain, 170
 U.K., 12, 162, 210, 238
 U.N. Agencies, 8
 UNESCO, 8, 23, 24, 52, 202, 312
 Union List, 91
 United Nations, 8
 University, Nathubhai Damodar, 156
 University Commission, 67; education, 68
 U.P., 20, 22, 173
 U.P. Government, 174 ,
 Urdu, 19
 U.S.A., 27, 34, 35, 162, 313

V

Vaishnav, H.G., 191, 199

Valiulla, M., 21, 23, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51
Vallatharas, K.M., 99
Vanaprasthashram, 113
Vedalankar, Archarya of Gurukul,
172
Veeraswamy, 154, 176, 190, 191, 192,
194, 195, 213
Verghese, T.M., 221
Vice-Chancellor of Delhi University,
12
Vijyavada, 127
Vijifdar, M.B., 34
Vijyawada, 127, 174
Vindhya Pradesh, 22
Vishal Andhra, 198
Vyas Krishnakanta, 39, 45, 46
Vyas, Radhalal, 99

W

Wadia, A.R., 311
Wales, 68
War of Indian Independence, 11
Wazir of Oudh, 17
West Bengal, 20, 22, 39
Women's Education, 296
Woods Charles, 121

Y

Yaksha, 132
Yogic Research, 37
Young Indians, 5
Youth Festival, 7

Z

Zakir Hussain, 155